arXiv:1511.02056v1 [math.GR] 6 Nov 2015

Polynomial-time right-ideal morphisms and congruences

J.C. Birget

5 Nov. 2015

Abstract

We continue with the functional approach to the P-versus-NP problem, begun in [3, 2]. We previously constructed a monoid $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ that is non-regular iff $\mathsf{NP} \neq \mathsf{P}$. We now construct homomorphic images of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ with interesting properties. In particular, the homomorphic image $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is finitely generated and $\mathcal{J}^0$-simple, and is non-regular iff $\mathsf{P} \neq \mathsf{NP}$. The group of units of $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ is the famous Richard Thompson group V.

1 Introduction

In [3] we defined the monoids fP and $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. The monoid fP consists of the partial functions $A^* \to A^*$ that are computable by deterministic Turing machines in polynomial time, and that have polynomial I/O-balance (defined below). In [3] it was proved that fP is finitely generated. The submonoid $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ consists of the elements of fP that are right-ideal morphisms of A^* (defined below). This monoid was studied further in [2], where we proved that $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is not finitely generated. We saw that the one-way functions (in the sense of worst-case time-complexity) are exactly the non-regular element of fP, and that $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is regular in fP iff f is regular in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. So, one-way functions exist iff fP is non-regular, iff $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is non-regular. It is well-known that one-way functions (according to worst-case time-complexity) exist iff $\mathsf{NP} \neq \mathsf{P}$. For P-vs.-NP, see e.g. [11, 8, 10]; for worst-case one-way functions, see e.g. [8, 10]. For definitions related to semigroups and monoids, see e.g. [9].

By definition, a function $f : A^* \to A^*$ is *polynomially balanced* iff there exists a polynomial p such that for all $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f)$: $|f(x)| \leq p(|x|)$ and $|x| \leq p(|f(x)|)$.

Here we always use $A = \{0, 1\}$ as our alphabet. In [3], $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ was called $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}_2$, where the subscript 2 indicated the size of A; but since here the size of A will always be 2, we drop the subscript 2.

We give some definitions. For an alphabet A, the set of all words over A is denoted by A^*; this includes the empty string ε. By a "word" or "string" we will always mean a finite word. The set of all non-empty words over A is denoted by A^+ $(= A^* - \{\varepsilon\})$. The length of a word $x \in A^*$ is denoted by $|x|$. For $n \geq 0$ we let $A^n = \{x \in A^* : |x| = n\}$, and $A^{\leq n} = \{x \in A^* : |x| \leq n\}$.

For two strings $v, w \in A^*$, when v is a *prefix* of w we write $v \leq_{\mathsf{pref}} w$; i.e., there exists $x \in A^*$ such that $vx = w$. The relation $\leq_{\mathsf{pref}}$ is a partial order on A^*, and is called the *prefix order*. We write $v <_{\mathsf{pref}} w$ when $v \leq_{\mathsf{pref}} w$ and $v \neq u$ (strict prefix order). We write $v \parallel_{\mathsf{pref}} w$ when $v \leq_{\mathsf{pref}} w$ or $w \leq_{\mathsf{pref}} v$, and then we say that v and w are *prefix-comparable*. One easily proves that $w \parallel_{\mathsf{pref}} v$ iff there exist $x_1, x_2 \in A^*$ such that $wx_1 = vx_2$. A set $P \subset A^*$ is a *prefix code* iff no two elements of P are prefix-comparable. A set $R \subseteq A^*$ is a *right ideal* iff $R\,A^* = R$. It is easy to prove (see e.g. [3]) that for every right ideal R there exists a unique prefix code P such that $R = P\,A^*$. For prefix codes and related concepts, see e.g. [1].

For a partial function $f : A^* \to A^*$, the domain is $\mathsf{Dom}(f) = \{x \in A^* : f(x) \text{ is defined}\}$, and the image is $\mathsf{Im}(f) = f(A^*) = f(\mathsf{Dom}(f))$. When we say "function", we mean partial function. When $\mathsf{Dom}(f) = A^*$, f is a called a total function.

A function $h : A^* \to A^*$ is a *right-ideal morphism* iff $\mathsf{Dom}(h)$ is a right ideal, and all $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(h)$ and all $w \in A^*$: $h(xw) = h(x)\,w$. In that case, $\mathsf{Im}(h)$ ia also a right ideal. For a right-ideal morphism

h, let $\mathsf{domC}(h)$ (called the *domain code*) be the prefix code that generates $\mathsf{Dom}(h)$ as a right ideal. Similarly, let $\mathsf{imC}(h)$, called the *image code*, be the prefix code that generates $\mathsf{Im}(h)$ as a right ideal. In general, $\mathsf{imC}(h) \subseteq h(\mathsf{domC}(h))$, and it can happen that $\mathsf{imC}(h) \neq h(\mathsf{domC}(h))$.

It will often be useful to represent any set $S \subseteq \{0,1,\#\}^*$ as a prefix code. We choose one way to do that, as follows. Let $P = \{00, 01, 11\}$; this is obviously a prefix code. We define $\mathsf{code}(0) = 00$, $\mathsf{code}(0) = 01$, $\mathsf{code}(\#) = 11$. For $w = a_1 \ \ldots \ a_1 \ \ldots \ a_n \in \{0,1,\#\}^*$ we define $\mathsf{code}(w) = \mathsf{code}(a_1) \ \ldots \ \mathsf{code}(a_i) \ \ldots \ \mathsf{code}(a_n)$. Then for every $L \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$, $\mathsf{code}(L)\,11$ (defined to be $\{\mathsf{code}(x)\,11 : x \in L\}$) is a prefix code. We also encode any function $f : A^* \to A^*$ into a right-deal morphism $f^C : A^* \to A^*$, defined by $\mathsf{domC}(f^C) = \mathsf{code}(\mathsf{Dom}(f))\ 11$, and $f^C(\mathsf{code}(x)\,11) = \mathsf{code}(f(x))\,11$ (for all $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f)$). The right-deal morphisms f^C, for $f \in \mathsf{fP}$, have the following important *normality* property (see Def. 5.6): $f^C\big(\mathsf{domC}(f^C)\big) = \mathsf{imC}(f^C)$. This follows immediately from the fact that $f^C\big(\mathsf{domC}(f^C)\big) = \{\mathsf{code}(f(x))\,11 \ : \ x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f)\}$ is a prefix code.

We define

$$\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}} \ = \ \{f \in \mathsf{fP} : f \text{ is a right-ideal morphism of } A^*\}.$$

By Prop. 2.6 in [3], if $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is regular in fP then f is regular in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. Hence: *The monoid $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is regular iff $\mathsf{P} = \mathsf{NP}$.*

Since $\mathsf{P} \neq \mathsf{NP}$ is equivalent to the non-regularity of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, we are interested in approaches towards proving (non-)regularity of this monoid. In this paper we study some congruences on $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$; these provide us with infinitely many homomorphic images of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. Four of these are of particular interest; they form a chain $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{E3}} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$. The last three are regular monoids. Moreover, we find a submonoid $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$ of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ which is non-regular, and which maps homomorphically onto $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$; in addition, $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$ is $\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}}$-equivalent to $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ (see the Remark at the end of the paper for details). Thus we have the following monoid homomorphisms (where $\nearrow$ is injective):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} & & & & \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}} & & & & \\ & & & \nearrow & \downarrow\!\!\downarrow & & & & \\ \mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)} & \twoheadrightarrow & \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}} & \twoheadrightarrow & \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{E3}} & \twoheadrightarrow & \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}} & \twoheadrightarrow & \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}} \end{array}$$

where $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ is regular iff $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is regular (Theorem 5.16), and $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{E3}}$ (hence $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$) are regular. On the other hand, $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$ is non-regular (Prop. 6.2). The triangle of maps starting at $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$ is a commutative diagram. These monoids have other interesting properties:

- $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ (hence its homomorphic images) is finitely generated (Theorem 4.7); on the other hand, $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is not finitely generated (see [2]).
- $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$ is congruence-simple and has only one non-zero $\mathcal{D}$-class (Theorems 2.23 and 2.22); so $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$ is the end of the chain.
- $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}}$ has exactly two non-zero $\mathcal{D}$-classes (Theorem 3.21), and acts faithfully on A^ω; in fact, $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}}$ is the monoid of the action of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ on A^ω (Prop. 3.8).
- The group of units of $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$, $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{E3}}$, and $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}}$, is the famous *Richard Thompson group V*, alias $G_{2,1}$ (Theorem 3.15(2)), whereas the group of units of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is trivial ([3] Prop. 2.12).

In the above homomorphism chain, the monoid $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ (which is regular iff $\mathsf{P} = \mathsf{NP}$) is placed between a monoid that is proved to be non-regular, and a monoid that is proved to be regular. Whether all this brings us closer to an answer to the P-vs.-NP question remains open.

2 End-equivalence

We start out with the most basic congruence on $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, which turns out to be maximal (i.e., it is not contained in any other congruence, except the trivial congruence).

Definition 2.1 *Two sets $L_1, L_2 \subseteq A^*$ are* end-equivalent *(denoted by $L_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} L_2$) iff the right ideals L_1A^* and L_2A^* intersect the same right ideals of A^* (i.e., for every right ideal $R \subseteq A^*$: $R \cap L_1A^* \neq \varnothing$ iff $R \cap L_2A^* \neq \varnothing$).*

Here we say that two sets S_1 and S_2 *intersect* iff $S_1 \cap S_2 \neq \varnothing$. Note that for $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$ it is intersection with L_iA^* that matters, not just intersection with L_i (unless L_i is already a right ideal). The empty set is only end-equivalent to itself. In the above definition it is sufficient to use monogenic right ideals (a monogenic right ideal is of the form wA^* with $w \in A^*$):

Lemma 2.2 *$L_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} L_2$ iff L_1A^* and L_2A^* intersect the same* monogenic right ideals.

Proof. Let R be any right ideal R that intersects L_1A^*, and let $x \in R \cap L_1A^*$. Then $xA^* \subseteq R$; and xA^* intersects L_1A^*, hence (by intersection with the same monogenic right ideals), xA^* intersects L_2A^*. So, since $xA^* \subseteq R$, R also intersects L_2A^*. In the same way one proves that every right ideal that intersects L_2A^* also intersects L_1A^*. □

Note that if $L_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} L_2$ and $L_1 \neq \varnothing$, then $L_1A^* \cap L_2A^* \neq \varnothing$. Indeed, L_1A^* has a non-empty intersection with itself, so by end-equivalence, L_1A^* intersects L_2A^* non-emptily too. However, if $L_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} L_2$ it could happen that $L_1 \cap L_2 = \varnothing$; e.g., let $L_1 = \{1\}$ and $L_2 = \{10, 11\}$.

Lemma 2.3 *Let $L_1, L_2 \subseteq A^*$.*

(1) *$L_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} L_2$ iff*

$$(\forall x_1 \in L_1,\, w_1 \in A^*)(\exists x_2 \in L_2)[\; x_1w_1 \parallel_{\mathsf{pref}} x_2 \,] \quad \text{and}$$
$$(\forall x_2 \in L_2,\, w_2 \in A^*)(\exists x_1 \in L_1)[\; x_1 \parallel_{\mathsf{pref}} x_2w_2 \,].$$

(2) *If $L_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} L_2$ then $L_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} L_2 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} L_1A^* \cap L_2A^* \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} L_1 \cup L_2$.*

Proof. (1) If L_1A^* and L_2A^* intersect the same right ideals then for every $x_1 \in L_1$ and $w_1 \in A^*$, the right ideal $x_1w_1A^*$ intersects L_2A^*; hence there exists $x_2 \in L_2$ and $u_1, u_2 \in A^*$ such that $x_1w_1u_1 = x_2u_2$. Hence, x_1w_1 and x_2 are prefix comparable. Similarly, for every $x_2 \in L_2$ and $w_2 \in A^*$ there exists $x_1 \in L_1$ such that x_1 and x_2w_2 are prefix comparable.

In the other direction, let us assume the prefix comparability condition, and let R be a right ideal that intersects L_1A^*. We want to show that R also intersects L_2A^*. Since R intersects L_1A^*, there exists $x_1w_1 \in R$ such that $x_1 \in L_1$ and $w_1 \in A^*$. Then let $x_2 \in L_2$ be prefix comparable with x_1w_1. If $x_1w_1 = x_2z$ for some $z \in A^*$ then $x_2z = x_1w_1 \in R$, so R intersects L_2A^*. If $x_2 = x_1w_1z$ for some $z \in A^*$ then $x_2 \in R$ (since $x_1w_1 \in R$, and R is a right ideal), so R intersects L_2 (and L_2A^*).

(2) Every right ideal that intersects $L_1A^* \cap L_2A^*$ obviously intersects L_1A^* and L_2A^*. If a right ideal R intersects L_1A^*, let $x_1w_1 \in L_1A^* \cap R$. Then by end-equivalence, the right ideal $x_1w_1A^*$ intersects L_2A^*, i.e., $x_1w_1z \in L_2A^*$ for some $z \in A^*$. But x_1w_1z also belongs to R, so R intersects $L_1A^* \cap L_2A^*$. So, L_1A^* and $L_1A^* \cap L_2A^*$ are end-equivalent.

If a right ideal R intersects $L_1 \cup L_2$ then R intersects L_1 or L_2. If R intersects L_1, then since $L_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} L_2$, it intersects L_2 too; so in any case, R intersects L_2. Hence, $L_1 \cup L_2 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} L_2$. □

Lemma 2.4 (1) *If f is a right-ideal morphism, and if $L_1, L_2 \subset \mathsf{Dom}(f)$ are sets such that $L_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} L_2$, then $f(L_1) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f(L_2)$.*

(2) *For any right-ideal morphism f, $f(\mathsf{domC}(f)) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{imC}(f)$.*

Proof. (1) Let R be any right ideal that intersects $f(L_1)\,A^*$, and let $y_1 \in R \cap f(L_1)\,A^*$. So, since $L_1 \subset \mathsf{Dom}(f)$, we have $y_1 = f(x_1)\,u_1$ for some $x_1 \in L_1$, $u_1 \in A^*$. And since $y_1 \in R$ we have also $x_1u_1 \in f^{-1}(y_1) \subseteq f^{-1}(R)$. Thus, $x_1u_1 \in f^{-1}(R) \cap L_1A^*$. Since $f^{-1}(R)$ is a right ideal and $L_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} L_2$, there exists $x_2u_2 \in f^{-1}(R) \cap L_2A^*$ (with $x_2 \in L_2$, $u_2 \in A^*$). Hence, $f(x_2)\,u_2 \in f(f^{-1}(R) \cap L_2A^*) \subseteq$

$R \cap f(L_2)\,A^*$; here we use $f(f^{-1}(R)) = R$ and $L_2 \subset \mathsf{Dom}(f)$. So, R intersects $f(L_2)\,A^*$. Similarly, any right ideal that intersects $f(L_2)\,A^*$ intersects $f(L_1)\,A^*$. Thus $f(L_1) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f(L_2)$.
(2) Obviously, $L \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} L\,A^*$ for any set $L \subseteq A^*$. We also have $f(\mathsf{domC}(f))\ A^* = f(\mathsf{domC}(f)\,A^*) = \mathsf{imC}(f)\,A^*$. Hence $f(\mathsf{domC}(f)) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{imC}(f)$. □

We call the elements of A^ω *ends*. See e.g. [12] for the study of infinite words. For a set $L \subseteq A^*$, the set $L\,A^\omega$ is called the *ends of* L, and denoted by $\mathsf{ends}(L)$; equivalently, $\mathsf{ends}(L)$ is the set of ends that have at least one prefix in L, so $\mathsf{ends}(L) = \mathsf{ends}(LA^*)$. The *Cantor set topology* on A^ω is described by $\{L\,A^\omega : L \subseteq A^*\}$ as set of open sets. Similarly, A^* is a topological space too, with the set of right ideals as set of open sets; we call this the *right-ideal topology* of A^*.

Notation: For $S \subseteq A^\omega$, the *closure* is denoted by $\mathsf{cl}(S)$, and the *interior* by $\mathsf{in}(S)$.

In any topological space, two sets intersect the same open sets iff they have the same closure. Hence we have the following topological characterization of end-equivalence.

Proposition 2.5 *For all $L_1, L_2 \subseteq A^*$: $L_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} L_2$ iff $\mathsf{cl}(\mathsf{ends}(L_1)) = \mathsf{cl}(\mathsf{ends}(L_2))$ in the Cantor space A^ω, iff $\mathsf{cl}(L_1) = \mathsf{cl}(L_2)$ in the right-ideal topology of A^*.* □

The following example illustrates the importance of closure in the above Proposition. Let $L_1 = 0^*1$, and $L_2 = \{\varepsilon\}$. Then $0^*1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \{\varepsilon\}$, and $\mathsf{cl}(0^*1\,\{0,1\}^\omega) = \{0,1\}^\omega = \mathsf{cl}(\{\varepsilon\}\,\{0,1\}^\omega)$. But $\mathsf{ends}(0^*1) \neq \mathsf{ends}(\{\varepsilon\})$, since $\mathsf{ends}(\{\varepsilon\}) = \{0,1\}^\omega$, while $\mathsf{ends}(0^*1) = 0^*1\,\{0,1\}^\omega = \{0,1\}^\omega - \{0^\omega\}$.

The equivalence relation $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$ can be generalized to a pre-order: For $L_1, L_2 \subseteq A^*$ we define $L_1 \subseteq_{\mathsf{end}} L_2$ iff every right ideal that intersects L_1A^* also intersects L_2A^*. Obviously, $L_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} L_2$ iff $L_1 \subseteq_{\mathsf{end}} L_2$ and $L_2 \subseteq_{\mathsf{end}} L_2$. And we have: $L_1 \subseteq_{\mathsf{end}} L_2$ iff $\mathsf{cl}(\mathsf{ends}(L_1)) \subseteq \mathsf{cl}(\mathsf{ends}(L_2))$.

The following Lemma shows that a one-point change in $\mathsf{ends}(P)$ does not change end-equivalence.

Lemma 2.6 *For any prefix code $P \subset A^*$ and any end $v \in \mathsf{ends}(P)$ there exists a prefix code, called $P(-v)$, such that $\mathsf{ends}(P(-v)) = \mathsf{ends}(P) - \{v\}$ and $P(-v) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P$.*

Proof. Let $v = v_1 \dots v_i \dots \in \mathsf{ends}(P)$, where $v_i \in A$ for all $i \geq 1$. Since $v \in \mathsf{ends}(P)$, there exists $i_0 \geq 0$ such that $v_1 \dots v_{i_0} \in P$. We now define

$$P(-v) \;=\; (P - \{v_1 \dots v_{i_0}\}) \;\cup\; \{v_1 \dots v_{i_0} \dots v_j\,\overline{v}_{j+1} \,:\, j \geq i_0\}.$$

The set $\{v_1 \dots v_{i_0} \dots v_j\,\overline{v}_{j+1} \,:\, j \geq i_0\}$ is the *border of the end* v from $v_1 \dots v_{i_0}$ onwards; indeed, $v_1 \dots v_{i_0} \dots v_j\,\overline{v}_{j+1}$ is the sibling node of $v_1 \dots v_{i_0} \dots v_j\,v_{j+1}$, and the latter is a prefix of v. Clearly, $P(-v)$ is a prefix code and $\mathsf{ends}(P(-v)) = \mathsf{ends}(P) - \{v\}$.

To show that $P(-v) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P$, let $R \subseteq A^*$ be any right ideal that intersects PA^* (at say $u \in R \cap PA^*$); we want to show that R also intersects $P(-v)\,A^*$. If $u \in (P - \{v_1 \dots v_{i_0}\})\ A^*$ then $u \in P(-v)\,A^*$. Alternatively, $v_1 \dots v_{i_0}$ is a prefix of u, i.e., $u = v_1 \dots v_{i_0}\,z$ for some $z \in A^*$. Let $v_1 \dots v_{i_0} \dots v_j$ be the longest prefix of u that is also a prefix of the end v. If $u = v_1 \dots v_{i_0} \dots v_j$, then $u\,\overline{v}_{j+1} = v_1 \dots v_{i_0} \dots v_j\overline{v}_{j+1} \in R \cap P(-v)\,A^*$; if, on the other hand, $|u| > j$ then u is of the form $u = v_1 \dots v_{i_0} \dots v_j\overline{v}_{j+1} \dots$ (the only alternative would be that $u = v_1 \dots v_{i_0} \dots v_jv_{j+1} \dots$, but that would contradict the maximality of j). Thus, $u = v_1 \dots v_{i_0} \dots v_j\overline{v}_{j+1} \dots$, which belongs to $P(-v)\,A^*$ (since $v_1 \dots v_{i_0} \dots v_j\overline{v}_{j+1} \in P(-v)$). □

Proposition 2.7 *For any prefix code $P \subset A^*$, we have:*

$$\textstyle\bigcup_{Q \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P} \mathsf{ends}(Q) \;=\; \mathsf{in}(\mathsf{cl}(\mathsf{ends}(P))), \quad \text{and} \quad \bigcup_{Q \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P} QA^* \;\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}\; P.$$

Moreover,

$$\textstyle\bigcap_{Q \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P} \mathsf{ends}(Q) \;=\; \varnothing \;=\; \bigcap_{Q \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P} QA^*.$$

Proof. Concerning the union of sets of ends:
[$\subseteq$]: If $Q \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P$, then (by Prop. 2.5), $\mathsf{ends}(Q) \subseteq \mathsf{cl}(\mathsf{ends}(P))$. And $\mathsf{ends}(Q)$ is open, hence $\mathsf{ends}(Q) \subseteq \mathsf{in}(\mathsf{cl}(\mathsf{ends}(P)))$.
[$\supseteq$]: If $x \in A^*$ is such that $\mathsf{ends}(\{x\}) \subseteq \mathsf{in}(\mathsf{cl}(\mathsf{ends}(P)))$, then $\mathsf{ends}(\{x\}) \subseteq \mathsf{cl}(\mathsf{ends}(P))$, hence $\mathsf{cl}(\mathsf{ends}(\{x\}) \subseteq \mathsf{cl}(\mathsf{ends}(P))$, hence $\mathsf{cl}(\mathsf{ends}(\{x\} \cup P)) = \mathsf{cl}(\mathsf{ends}(P))$. Therefore, $\{x\} \cup P \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P$ (by Prop. 2.5). Thus, $\mathsf{ends}(\{x\}) \subseteq \bigcup_{Q \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P} \mathsf{ends}(Q)$ for every $\mathsf{ends}(\{x\}) \subseteq \mathsf{in}(\mathsf{cl}(\mathsf{ends}(P)))$; thus $\mathsf{in}(\mathsf{cl}(\mathsf{ends}(P))) \subseteq \bigcup_{Q \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P} \mathsf{ends}(Q)$.

Concerning the union of the QA^*: Let R be any right ideal that intersects $\bigcup_{Q \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P} QA^*$. Then (by the definition of union) there exists $Q \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P$ such that R intersects QA^*. Since $Q \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P$, every right ideal intersecting QA^* intersects PA^*, so R intersects PA^*. Conversely, it is obvious that every right ideal that intersects P also intersects $\bigcup_{Q \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P} QA^*$. Thus, $\bigcup_{Q \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P} QA^* \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P$.

Concerning the intersection of the QA^*, we observe that for any $n > 0$, $P\,A^n \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P$. Moreover, $\bigcap_{n>0} P\,A^n\,A^* = \varnothing$ (since for any length n, this intersection contains no word of length $< n$). Hence $\bigcap_{Q \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P} QA^*$ (which is a subset of $\bigcap_{n>0} P\,A^n\,A^*$) is $\varnothing$.

Concerning the intersection of the $\mathsf{ends}(Q)$: By Lemma 2.6 we have $\bigcap_{v \in \mathsf{ends}(P)} P(-v) = \varnothing$. The result follows, since $P(-v) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P$. $\square$

End-equivalence can also be defined for right-ideal morphisms:

Definition 2.8 *Two right-ideal morphisms f_1, f_2 are* end-equivalent *(denoted by $f_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f_2$) iff $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$, and the restrictions of f_1 and f_2 to $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$ are equal.*

Notation: By $[f]_{\mathsf{end}}$ we denote the $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$-equivalence class of f in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. So for $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ we have $[f]_{\mathsf{end}} = \{g \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}} : g \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f\} \subset \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. Note that although $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$ is defined for all right-ideal morphisms, we define $[f]_{\mathsf{end}}$ to contain only elements of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$.

Proposition 2.9 *(1) Let $P_1, P_2 \subset A^*$ be prefix codes such that $P_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P_2$, let $P_\cap$ be the prefix code that generates the right ideal $P_1A^* \cap P_2A^*$, and let $P_\cup$ be the prefix code that generates the right ideal $P_1A^* \cup P_2A^*$. Then $P_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P_2 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P_\cap \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P_\cup$.*
(2) Let f_1, f_2 be right-ideal morphisms such that $f_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f_2$. Then $f_1 \cap f_2$ and $f_1 \cup f_2$ are right-ideal morphisms, and $f_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f_2 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f_1 \cap f_2 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f_1 \cup f_2$.
(3) If $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ then $f_1 \cap f_2$, $f_1 \cup f_2 \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$.

Proof. (1) This follows from Lemma 2.3(2), and the fact that $LA^* \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} L$ for all sets $L \subseteq A^*$.
(2) By (1) we have $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Dom}(f_2) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Dom}(f_1) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(f_2) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Dom}(f_1) \cup \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$. Also, $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1 \cap f_2) = \mathsf{Dom}(f_1) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$. And since $f_1 = f_2$ on $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1 \cap f_2)$ we have $f_1 = f_1 \cap f_2$ on $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1 \cap f_2)$. Hence $f_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f_1 \cap f_2$, and similarly for f_2. Also, $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1 \cup f_2) = \mathsf{Dom}(f_1) \cup \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$. And $f_1 = f_1 \cup f_2$ on $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1)$, and $f_2 = f_1 \cup f_2$ on $\mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$, hence $f_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f_1 \cup f_2 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f_2$.
(3) Since the complexity class P is closed under $\cap$ and $\cup$, $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1 \cap f_2)$ and $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1 \cup f_2)$ belong to P. Since $f_1 \cap f_2$ is the restriction of f_1 to $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1 \cap f_2)$, we have $f_1 \cap f_2 \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}_2$. To compute $(f_1 \cup f_2)(x)$ in polynomial time, check whether $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_1)$, and if so, compute $f_1(x)$; otherwise, check whether $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$, and compute $f_2(x)$. $\square$

Corollary 2.10 *Every $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$-class (within $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ or within the monoid of all right-ideal morphisms) is a lattice under $\subseteq$, $\cup$ and $\cap$. In particular, $[f]_{\mathsf{end}}$ is a lattice, for every $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$.*

Proof. The lattice property follows from Prop. 2.9. $\square$

Proposition 2.11 (preservation of injectiveness under $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$).
If f, g are right-ideal morphisms such that $g \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f$, and if f is injective, then g is injective.

Proof. From $g \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f$ it follows that f and g agree on $D = \mathsf{Dom}(g) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(f)$. So, $h = g|_D = f|_D$ is injective. Also, $h \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} g$. To show that g is injective, let $x_1, x_2 \in \mathsf{Dom}(g)$ be such that $g(x_1) = g(x_2)$. From $\mathsf{Dom}(h) \subseteq \mathsf{Dom}(g)$ and $\mathsf{Dom}(h) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Dom}(g)$ it follows that for any word u that is long enough we have $x_1u, x_2u \in \mathsf{Dom}(h)$. Since $g(x_1) = g(x_2)$ we also have $h(x_1u) = g(x_1u) = g(x_2u) = h(x_2u)$. Hence by injectiveness of h we have $x_1u = x_2u$; hence $x_1 = x_2$, so g is injective. □

Definition 2.12 (maximum extension). *For any right-ideal morphism $f : A^* \to A^*$ we define*

$$f_{\mathsf{e,max}} \;=\; \bigcup \{g : g \text{ is a right-ideal morphism with } g \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f\}.$$

Note also that it can happen that $f_{\mathsf{e,max}} \notin \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ when $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ (and that is in fact the "usual" case – see Prop. 3.9).

Proposition 2.13.
(1) For every right-ideal morphism f, $f_{\mathsf{e,max}}$ is a function, and a right-ideal morphism $A^* \to A^*$. It is the maximum extension of f among all right-ideal morphisms that are $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f$. So, $f_{\mathsf{e,max}} \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f$, and $f_{\mathsf{e,max}}$ is the unique right-ideal morphism that is maximal (under $\subseteq$) in the set $\{g : g$ is a right-ideal morphism, and $f \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} g\}$.
(2) For any right-ideal morphisms $h, k : A^* \to A^*$:

$$h \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} k \quad \textit{iff} \quad h_{\mathsf{e,max}} = k_{\mathsf{e,max}}.$$

Proof. (1) If $f_{\mathsf{e,max}}$ were not a function there would exist right-ideal morphisms g_1, g_2 such that $g_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} g_2 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f$, $f \subseteq g_1$, $f \subseteq g_2$, and for some $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(g_1) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(g_2)$: $g_1(x) \neq g_2(x)$. But $f \subseteq g_1 \cup g_2$, and by Prop. 2.9, $f \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} g_i \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} g_1 \cup g_2$, and $g_1 \cup g_2$ is a function. Hence $g_1(x) = g_2(x)$ for all $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(g_1) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(g_2)$. So, $f_{\mathsf{e,max}}(x)$ has at most one value for all x. The facts that $f_{\mathsf{e,max}}$ is a right-ideal morphism, and that it is maximum, are straightforward.

By Prop. 2.7, $\mathsf{Dom}(f) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \bigcup_{g \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f} \mathsf{Dom}(g)$. Since $f_{\mathsf{e,max}}$ agrees with f on $\mathsf{Dom}(f)$ we conclude that $f \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f_{\mathsf{e,max}}$.
(2) This follows immediately from $f \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f_{\mathsf{e,max}}$. □

A right-ideal morphism $f : A^* \to A^*$ can be extended to the partial function $f : A^\omega \to A^\omega$, defined as follows:

$$f(pw) = f(p)\, w, \;\text{ for any } p \in \mathsf{domC}(f) \text{ and } w \in A^\omega.$$

Then $\mathsf{Dom}(f) \cap A^\omega = \mathsf{domC}(f)\, A^\omega = \mathsf{Dom}(f)\, A^\omega$; and $\mathsf{Im}(f) \cap A^\omega = \mathsf{imC}(f)\, A^\omega = \mathsf{Im}(f)\, A^\omega$. We use the same name f for the extended function, and its restrictions to A^* or to A^ω; the context will always make it clear which function is being used.

Any right-ideal morphism $f : A^* \to A^*$ is continuous (with respect to the topology defined on A^* by the right ideals); indeed, for every right ideal $R \subseteq A^*$, $f^{-1}(R)$ is a right ideal. Similarly, the extension of f to A^ω is a continuous function in the Cantor space topology.

Lemma 2.14 *There exist right-ideal morphisms $f, g : A^* \to A^*$ such that*

$$\mathsf{Dom}(f_{\mathsf{e,max}})\; A^\omega \;\subsetneq\; \mathsf{in}(\mathsf{cl}(\mathsf{Dom}(f)\; A^\omega)), \quad \textit{and}$$
$$g_{\mathsf{e,max}} \circ f_{\mathsf{e,max}} \;\neq\; (g \circ f)_{\mathsf{e,max}}\ .$$

Proof. For example, let $\mathsf{domC}(f) = 0^*1$, and $f(0^{2n}1) = 0^{2n+1}1$, and $f(0^{2n+1}1) = 0^{2n}1$, for all $n \geq 0$. Then $f = f_{\mathsf{e,max}}$; indeed, any strict extension of f would need to make $f(0^m)$ defined for some $m \geq 0$; but such an extension to a right-ideal morphism would not agree with f on $\mathsf{Dom}(f)$ (since f transposes $0^{2n}1$ and $0^{2n+1}1$). So, $\mathsf{Dom}(f_{\mathsf{e,max}})\; \{0,1\}^\omega = 0^*1\, \{0,1\}^\omega$, whereas $\mathsf{cl}(0^*1\, \{0,1\}^\omega) = \{0,1\}^\omega$, and $\mathsf{in}(\{0,1\}^\omega) = \{0,1\}^\omega$.

Since f in the above example is injective, we can let $g = f^{-1}$. We have $f = f_{\mathsf{e,max}}$ and $f^{-1} = (f^{-1})_{\mathsf{e,max}}$. Then $g_{\mathsf{e,max}} \circ f_{\mathsf{e,max}}$ is the identity restricted to $0^*1\, \{0,1\}^*$, whose maximum end-equivalent extension is the full identity $\mathbf{1}_{A^*}$. So in this example, $g_{\mathsf{e,max}} \circ f_{\mathsf{e,max}} \neq (g \circ f)_{\mathsf{e,max}}$. □

Lemma 2.15 *Let f_1, f_2 be right-ideal morphisms with $f_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f_2$, and let $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_1)$. Then there exists $v \in A^*$ such that $xvA^* \subseteq \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$, and for all $w \in A^*$: $f_2(xvw) = f_1(xvw)$.*

Proof. If $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_1)$ then the right ideal xA^* intersects $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1)$, hence xA^* intersects $\mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$ (since $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$). Thus there exists $xv \in xA^*$ such that $xv \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$. Hence $xvA^* \subseteq \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$ (since $\mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$ is a right ideal). We have $f_2(xvw) = f_1(xvw)$ because f_1 and f_2 agree where they are both defined. □

Just as we saw for right-ideal morphisms in general, $f_{\mathsf{e,max}}$ can be extended to $\mathsf{domC}(f_{\mathsf{e,max}})\, A^\omega$.

Proposition 2.16 *For all right-ideal morphisms $f, g : A^* \to A^*$ we have:*

$$g \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f \quad \textit{iff} \quad g_{\mathsf{e,max}} = f_{\mathsf{e,max}} \textit{ on } A^\omega.$$

Proof. The implication "⇒" is clear from the definitions. Conversely, if $g_{\mathsf{e,max}}$ and $f_{\mathsf{e,max}}$ act the same on A^ω then $\mathsf{Dom}(g_{\mathsf{e,max}})\, A^\omega = \mathsf{Dom}(f_{\mathsf{e,max}})\, A^\omega$, hence $\mathsf{cl}(\mathsf{Dom}(g_{\mathsf{e,max}})\, A^\omega) = \mathsf{cl}(\mathsf{Dom}(f_{\mathsf{e,max}})\, A^\omega)$. Hence (by Prop. 2.5), $\mathsf{Dom}(g_{\mathsf{e,max}}) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Dom}(f_{\mathsf{e,max}})$. Since $\mathsf{Dom}(h) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Dom}(h_{\mathsf{e,max}})$ for any righ-ideal morphism h, we conclude that $\mathsf{Dom}(g) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Dom}(f)$.

Since for all $w \in A^\omega$, $g_{\mathsf{e,max}}(w) = f_{\mathsf{e,max}}(w)$, we have for all $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(g) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(f)$ and all $v \in A^\omega$: $g_{\mathsf{e,max}}(xv) = f_{\mathsf{e,max}}(xv)$. Hence (since $g_{\mathsf{e,max}}(xv) = g_{\mathsf{e,max}}(x)\ v$, and similarly for f), $g_{\mathsf{e,max}}(x)\ v = f_{\mathsf{e,max}}(x)\ v$, for all $v \in A^\omega$. Lemma 2.15 then implies $g_{\mathsf{e,max}}(x) = f_{\mathsf{e,max}}(x)$, for all $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(g) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(f)$. Since $g_{\mathsf{e,max}}$ agrees with g on $\mathsf{Dom}(g)$ (and similarly for f), we conclude that $g(x) = f(x)$, for all $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(g) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(f)$. Hence, $g \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f$. □

Remark. It is also true that $g \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f$ is equivalent to the following: $\mathsf{Dom}(g) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Dom}(f)$, and g and f agree on $\mathsf{ends}(\mathsf{Dom}(g)) \cap \mathsf{ends}(\mathsf{Dom}(f))$. However, $g \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f$ is *not* equivalent to the property that g and f agree on A^ω; indeed, the actions of g and f on A^ω could have different domains (even if $g \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f$). In Cor. 3.8 we will see that g and f agree on A^ω iff $g \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} f$ (which is a different congruence than $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$).

Proposition 2.17 *The relation $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$ is a* congruence *for right-ideal morphisms; i.e., for all right-ideal morphisms f_1, f_2, g: if $f_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f_2$, then $f_1 g \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f_2 g$ and $g f_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} g f_2$.*

Proof. The result follows from the next four claims.

Claim 1. $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1 g) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Dom}(f_2 g)$.

Proof. Let R be a right-ideal that intersects $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1 g)$, so there exists $x_1 \in R$ such that $x_1 \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_1 g)$; equivalently, $g(x_1) \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_1)$. Thus, $g(R)$ intersects $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1)$, therefore (since $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$, and $g(R)$ is a right ideal) $g(R)$ intersects $\mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$. So, for some $g(x_2) \in g(R)$ with $x_2 \in R$, $g(x_2) \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$. The latter is equivalent to $x_2 \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_2 g)$; so R intersects $\mathsf{Dom}(f_2 g)$. [This proves Claim 1.]

Claim 2. $f_1 g$ and $f_2 g$ agree on $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1 g) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(f_2 g)$.

Proof. Suppose $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_1 g) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(f_2 g)$. Then $f_1 g(x)$ and $f_2 g(x)$ are defined, so $g(x) \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_1) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$. Hence, since f_1 and f_2 agree on $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$ (because $f_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f_2$), we have $f_1 g(x) = f_2 g(x)$. [This proves Claim 2.]

Claim 3. $\mathsf{Dom}(g f_1) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Dom}(g f_2)$.

Proof. Let R be a right ideal that intersects $\mathsf{Dom}(g f_1)$, so there exists x such that $g f_1(x)$ is defined, hence $f_1(x)$ is defined. Hence, by Lemma 2.15, there exists $v \in A^*$ such that $xv \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_1) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$, and $f_1(xv) = f_2(xv)$. Thus, $g f_1(xv) = g f_2(xv)$. So, $xv \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$. Since R is a right ideal, $xv \in R$, hence R intersects $\mathsf{Dom}(g f_2)$.

In a similar way one proves that every right ideal that intersects $\mathsf{Dom}(g f_2)$ also intersects $\mathsf{Dom}(g f_1)$. [This proves Claim 3.]

Claim 4. $f_1 g$ and $f_2 g$ agree on $\mathsf{Dom}(g f_1) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(g f_2)$.

Proof. Since $f_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f_2$, f_1 and f_2 agree on $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$. Moreover, $\mathsf{Dom}(g f_i) \subseteq \mathsf{Dom}(f_i)$ (for $i = 1, 2$), so the Claim holds. [This proves Claim 4.] □

Corollary 2.18 *For all right-ideal morphisms* $f, g : A^* \to A^*$, $(g_{\mathsf{e,max}} \circ f_{\mathsf{e,max}})_{\mathsf{e,max}} = (g \circ f)_{\mathsf{e,max}}$.

Proof. By Prop. 2.13(1), $g_{\mathsf{e,max}} \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} g$ and $f_{\mathsf{e,max}} \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f$. Hence by Prop. 2.17, $g_{\mathsf{e,max}} \circ f_{\mathsf{e,max}} \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} g \circ f$; and by Prop. 2.13(1), $g \circ f \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} (g \circ f)_{\mathsf{e,max}}$. $\Box$

Definition 2.19 (ends monoid $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$). *The* ends monoid *consists of the* $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$*-classes of* $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$*; the multiplication is the multiplication of* $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$*-classes. It is denoted by* $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$*, or by* $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}/\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$.

As a set, $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}} = \{[f]_{\mathsf{end}} : f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}\}$. The multiplication in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$ is well-defined since $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$ is a congruence, by Prop. 2.17. Hence, $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$ is a monoid which is a homomorphic image of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. The monoid version $M_{2,1}$ of the Richard Thompson group V (a.k.a. $G_{2,1}$) is a submonoid of $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$; $M_{2,1}$ is defined in [5]; see [7] for more information on the Thompson group.

There is a one-to-one correspondence between $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$-classes and maximum end-extensions of elements of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ (by Prop. 2.16). So, $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$ can also be defined as

$$\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}} = (\{f_{\mathsf{e,max}} : f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}\}, \cdot)$$

with multiplication "$\cdot$" defined by

$$g_{\mathsf{e,max}} \cdot f_{\mathsf{e,max}} = (g_{\mathsf{e,max}} \circ f_{\mathsf{e,max}})_{\mathsf{e,max}} \quad (= (g \circ f)_{\mathsf{e,max}}).$$

Here we used Cor. 2.18.

For the remainder of this section we need some definitions.

For any monoid M, the $\mathcal{L}$*-order* (denoted by $\leq_{\mathcal{L}}$) and the $\mathcal{R}$*-order* (denoted by $\leq_{\mathcal{R}}$), are defined (for any $s, t, u, v \in M$) by $t \leq_{\mathcal{L}} s$ iff there exists $m \in M$ such that $t = ms$; and $v \leq_{\mathcal{R}} u$ iff there exists $n \in M$ such that $v = un$. The $\mathcal{D}$*-relation* on M is defined (for $x, y \in M$) by $x \equiv_{\mathcal{D}} y$ iff there exists $z \in M$ such that $x \equiv_{\mathcal{R}} z \equiv_{\mathcal{L}} y$; equivalently, there exists $w \in M$ such that $x \equiv_{\mathcal{L}} w \equiv_{\mathcal{R}} y$. A monoid M is called $\mathcal{D}^0$*-simple* if M has only one $\mathcal{D}$-class, except possibly for a zero. These are well-known concepts in semigroup theory; see e.g., [9].

A right ideal $R \subseteq A^*$ is called *essential* iff $R \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} A^*$ (iff $\mathsf{cl}(\mathsf{ends}(R)) = A^\omega$). Equivalently, the prefix code that generated R (as a right ideal) is a *maximal* prefix code.

For any function $f : A^* \to A^*$, the relation $\mathsf{mod}f$ is the equivalence relation defined on $\mathsf{Dom}(f)$ by $x_1 \ \mathsf{mod}f \ x_2$ iff $f(x_1) = f(x_2)$. The equivalence classes of $\mathsf{mod}f$ are $\{f^{-1}f(x) : x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f)\}$. For two partial functions $g, f : A^* \to A^*$, we say $\mathsf{mod}f \leq \mathsf{mod}g$ ("the relation $\mathsf{mod}f$ is *coarser* than $\mathsf{mod}g$", or "$\mathsf{mod}g$ is *finer* than $\mathsf{mod}f$") iff $\mathsf{Dom}(f) \subseteq \mathsf{Dom}(g)$, and for all $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f)$: $g^{-1}g(x) \subseteq f^{-1}f(x)$. Equivalently, $\mathsf{mod}f \leq \mathsf{mod}g$ iff every $\mathsf{mod}f$-class is a union of $\mathsf{mod}g$-classes.

A monoid M is called *congruence-simple* iff M is non-trivial and the only congruences on M are the equality relation and the one-class congruence.

The *length-lexicographic order* on $\{0,1\}^*$ is a well-order, defined as follows for any $x_1, x_2 \in \{0,1\}^*$: $x_1 \leq_{\ell\ell} x_2$ iff $|x_1| < |x_2|$, or $|x_1| = |x_2|$ and x_1 precedes x_2 in the dictionary order on $\{0,1\}^*$ (based on the alphabetic order $0 < 1$).

The next lemma is the $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$-version of Prop. 2.1 of [3].

Lemma 2.20 *If* $f, r \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ *and* r *is* regular *with an inverse* $r' \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ *then:*

(1) $f \leq_{\mathcal{R}} r$ *iff* $f = rr'f$ *iff* $\mathsf{Im}(f) \subseteq \mathsf{Im}(r)$.

(2) $f \leq_{\mathcal{L}} r$ *iff* $f = fr'r$ *iff* $\mathsf{mod}f \leq \mathsf{mod}r$.

Proof. (1) $f \leq_{\mathcal{R}} r$ iff for some $u \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$: $f = ru$. Then $f = rr'ru = rr'f$. Also, it is straightforward that $f = ru$ implies $\mathsf{Im}(f) \subseteq \mathsf{Im}(r)$.

Conversely, if $\mathsf{Im}(f) \subseteq \mathsf{Im}(r)$ then $\mathsf{id}_{\mathsf{Im}(f)} = \mathsf{id}_{\mathsf{Im}(r)} \circ \mathsf{id}_{\mathsf{Im}(f)} = r \circ r'|_{\mathsf{Im}(r)} \circ \mathsf{id}_{\mathsf{Im}(f)}$. Hence, $f = \mathsf{id}_{\mathsf{Im}(f)} \circ f = r \circ r'|_{\mathsf{Im}(r)} \circ \mathsf{id}_{\mathsf{Im}(f)} \circ f = r \circ r'|_{\mathsf{Im}(r)} \circ f \leq_{\mathcal{R}} r$.

(2) $f \leq_{\mathcal{L}} r$ iff for some $v \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$: $f = vr$. Then $f = vrr'r = fr'r$. And it is straightforward that $f = vr$ implies $\mathsf{mod}f \leq \mathsf{mod}r$.

Conversely, if $\mathsf{mod}f \leq \mathsf{mod}r$ then for all $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f)$, $r^{-1}r(x) \subseteq f^{-1}f(x)$. And for every $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f)$, $\{f(x)\} = f \circ f^{-1} \circ f(x)$. Moreover, $f \circ r^{-1} \circ r(x) \subseteq f \circ f^{-1} \circ f(x) = \{f(x)\}$, and since $r^{-1} \circ r(x) \neq \varnothing$, it follows that $f \circ r^{-1} \circ r(x) = \{f(x)\}$. So, $f = f \circ r^{-1} \circ r$. Moreover, $f \circ r' \circ r(x) \in f \circ r^{-1} \circ r(x) = \{f(x)\}$, hence $f \circ r' \circ r(x) = f(x)$. Hence, $f = fr'r \leq_{\mathcal{L}} r$. $\square$

Definition 2.21 (rank function). *For any set $S \subseteq A^*$ the* rank function *of S is defined for all $x \in S$ by $\mathsf{rank}_S(x) = |\{z \in S : z \leq_{\ell\ell} x\}|$ (where $\leq_{\ell\ell}$ denotes the length-lexicographic order). When $x \notin S$, $\mathsf{rank}_S(x)$ is undefined.*

Theorem 2.22 *The monoid $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$ is regular, $\mathcal{D}^0$-simple, and finitely generated.*

Proof. An initial remark: Every $\mathcal{D}^0$-simple monoid is regular; but we prove regularity separately first because it will be used in the proof of $\mathcal{D}^0$-simplicity.

For every $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ there exists an inverse function f' which is balanced, but which is not necessarily polynomial-time computable; balance is inherited from f if we restrict the domain of f' to $\mathsf{Im}(f)$. Let $T(.)$ be the time complexity of f'. We can restrict both f and f' in order to reduce the time complexity (padding argument), while preserving end-equivalence, as follows: We replace the prefix code $\mathsf{domC}(f')$ of $\mathsf{Dom}(f')$ by the prefix code

$$\bigcup_{y \in \mathsf{domC}(f')} y\, A^{T(|y|)}$$

where $A^{T(|y|)}$ is the set of all words of length $T(|y|)$. Let F' be this restriction of f', and let the restriction of f be $F = \mathsf{id}_{\mathsf{Dom}(F')} \circ f$. Then F and F' have polynomial time-complexity, so $F, F' \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. Moreover, F' is an inverse of F, and $f \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} F$, and $f' \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} F'$. Therefore, $f \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} F = FF'F \in [f]_{\mathsf{end}} \cdot [F']_{\mathsf{end}} \cdot [f]_{\mathsf{end}}$. Hence $[f]_{\mathsf{end}} = [f]_{\mathsf{end}} \cdot [F']_{\mathsf{end}} \cdot [f]_{\mathsf{end}}$, so $[f]_{\mathsf{end}}$ is regular in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$.

Proof of $\mathcal{D}^0$-simplicity: For every non-empty $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ there exists $f_0 \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ such that $f \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f_0$ and such that $\mathsf{imC}(f_0)$ is infinite. Indeed, let us pick some $x_0 \in \mathsf{domC}(f)$ and define f_0 by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathsf{domC}(f_0) \;=\; (\mathsf{domC}(f) - \{x_0\}) \;\cup\; x_0\, 0^*1;\\
&f_0(x_0\, 0^n 1) = f(x_0)\, 0^n 1 \quad \text{for all } n \geq 0, \text{ and}\\
&f_0(x) = f(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathsf{domC}(f) - \{x_0\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then $\mathsf{imC}(f_0)$ contains $f(x_0)\, 0^*1$, hence it is infinite. So, from now on we assume that for f itself, $\mathsf{imC}(f)$ is infinite.

Claim: If $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ has infinite $\mathsf{imC}(f)$, then there exists a right-ideal morphism g with the following properties: g is partial recursive with decidable domain, $\mathsf{domC}(g)$ is a maximal prefix code, g is injective, and $\mathsf{Im}(g) = \mathsf{Im}(f)$.

Proof of the Claim: We construct g as follows. Let $\leq_{\ell\ell}$ denote the length-lexicographic order on $\{0,1\}^*$. For any $y \in \mathsf{imC}(f)$, we can compute $\mathsf{rank}(y) = |\{z \in \mathsf{imC}(f) : z \leq_{\ell\ell} y\}|$; computability follows from the fact that f is polynomially balanced. The function rank is injective; it is also onto $\mathbb{N}$ since $\mathsf{imC}(f)$ is infinite. We define $g(0^n1)$ to be the element $y \in \mathsf{imC}(f)$ such that $\mathsf{rank}(y) = n$ (for any $n \geq 0$). So, g is injective and $g^{-1}(y) = 0^{\mathsf{rank}(y)}1$ for all $y \in \mathsf{imC}(f)$. We have $\mathsf{domC}(g) = 0^*1$, which is a maximal prefix code; obviously, 0^*1 is a decidable language. Then g is partial recursive with decidable domain, and injective, and $\mathsf{Im}(f) = \mathsf{Im}(g)$. This proves the Claim.

Let $\Theta_g(.)$ be the time-complexity of some deterministic Turing machine that computes g; the function $\Theta_g(.)$ is partial recursive with decidable domain, hence $\Theta_g(.)$ can be extended to a total recursive function. Let T_g be an upper bound on both $\Theta_g(.)$ and on the time it takes to compute $\Theta_g(.)$. Then, by padding f and g by the amount $T_g(.)$ we obtain functions $f_1, g_1 \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ such that $f \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f_1$, $g \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} g_1$, and both f_1 and g_1 are regular in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. Moreover, $\mathsf{domC}(g_1)$ is a maximal prefix

code (equivalently, $\mathsf{Dom}(g_1)$ is an essential right ideal), g_1 is injective, and $\mathsf{Im}(f_1) = \mathsf{Im}(g_1)$. Note that because of the padding by T_g, f_1 and g_1 have linear time-complexity.

Since $\mathsf{Im}(f_1) = \mathsf{Im}(g_1)$ and f_1, g_1 are regular elements of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, Lemma 2.20(1) implies $f_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{R}} g_1$.

Since g_1 is injective, the relation $\mathsf{mod} g_1$ is the equality relation on $\mathsf{Dom}(g_1)$. Hence, since g_1 is a regular element of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, Lemma 2.20(2) implies that $g_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{L}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Dom}(g_1)}$ (the identity map restricted to $\mathsf{Dom}(g_1)$). Since $\mathsf{domC}(g_1)$ is a maximal prefix code, $\mathsf{Dom}(g_1)$ is an essential right ideal; equivalently, $\mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Dom}(g_1)} \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathbf{1}$.

Overall we now have $f \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{R}} g_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{L}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Dom}(g_1)} \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathbf{1}$. Hence, in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$, $[f]_{\mathsf{end}} \equiv_{\mathcal{D}} [\mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{end}}$.

Proof of finite generation: The proof is based on the fact that fP and $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ have evaluation maps for programs with bounded polynomial balance and time-complexity. This was described in detail in Section 4 of [3] and Section 2 of [2]. We briefly give the definition here: For a polynomial q_2 such that $q_2(n) = a\,(n^2+1)$ (for some fixed large constant a), we define an *evaluation map* $\mathsf{evR}^C_{q_2} \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ by

$$\mathsf{evR}^C_{q_2}(\mathsf{code}(w)\ 11\, uv) \ = \ \mathsf{code}(w)\ 11\ \phi_w(u)\ v,$$

for all Turing machine programs w with balance and time-complexity $\leq q_2$, and all $u \in \mathsf{domC}(\phi_w)$, and $v \in A^*$. Here, $\phi_w \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ denotes the function with program w. Then we have

$$\phi_w \ = \ \pi'_{|\mathsf{code}(w)\,11|} \circ \mathsf{evR}^C_{q_2} \circ \pi_{\mathsf{code}(w)\,11}.$$

where π'_n is defined by $\pi'_n(x_1x_2) = x_2$ whenever $x_1, x_2 \in A^*$ with $|x_1| = n$ (and π'_n is undefined on other arguments); and π_u is defined by $\pi_u(x) = ux$ for all $u, x \in A^*$. See [2] for the proof that such a function $\mathsf{evR}^C_{q_2}$ exists.

In the proof of regularity of $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$ above, we saw that every $\phi_v \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is end-equivalent to some $\phi_w \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ such that ϕ_w has linear time-complexity. We can obtain ϕ_w as $\phi_w = \phi_v \circ \mathsf{id}_{P_w}$, where

$$P_w \ = \ \textstyle\bigcup_{x \in \mathsf{domC}(\phi_v)} x\, A^{T(|x|)^2};$$

here, $T(.)$ is the time-complexity of ϕ_w. Since the time-complexity of ϕ_w is linear with small coefficients, the evaluation map $\mathsf{evR}^C_{q_2}$ can evaluate ϕ_w without any need for further padding; so we have

$$\phi_v \ \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \ \phi_w \ = \ \pi'_{|\mathsf{code}(w)\,11|} \circ \mathsf{evR}^C_{q_2} \circ \pi_{\mathsf{code}(w)\,11}\ .$$

So, $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$ is generated by $\{[\pi_0]_{\mathsf{end}}, [\pi_1]_{\mathsf{end}}, [\pi'_1]_{\mathsf{end}}, [\mathsf{evR}^C_{q_2}]_{\mathsf{end}}\}$. $\square$

Theorem 2.23 *$\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$ is congruence-simple.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of congruence-simplicity of the Thompson-Higman monoid $M_{2,1}$ in the Appendix of [4]. Let $\mathbf{0}$ be the $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$-class of the empty map; this class consists only of the empty map 0. When $\cong$ is any congruence on $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$ that is not the equality relation, we will show that the whole monoid $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$ is congruent to $\mathbf{0}$. We will make use of $\mathcal{J}^0$-simplicity of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ (and hence $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$).

Since $\cong$ is a congruence on $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$, and since $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$ is a congruence on $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, it follows that $\cong$ can also be defined as a congruence on $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ that is coarser than $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$. We will show that if $\cong$ on $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is not $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$, then $\cong$ is the trivial (one-class) congruence.

Case (0): Assume that $\Phi \cong \mathbf{0}$ for some element $\Phi \neq \mathbf{0}$ in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$. Then for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$ we have obviously $\alpha\,\Phi\,\beta \cong \mathbf{0}$. Moreover, by $\mathcal{J}^0$-simplicity, $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}} = \{\alpha\,\Phi\,\beta : \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}\}$, since $\Phi \neq \mathbf{0}$. Hence all elements are congruent to $\mathbf{0}$.

For the remainder of the proof we let $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}} - \{0\}$ be representatives of two different $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$-classes (i.e., $\varphi \not\equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \psi$) such that $[\varphi]_{\mathsf{end}} \cong [\psi]_{\mathsf{end}}$. Notation: For any $u, v \in A^*$, $(v \leftarrow u)$ denotes the right-ideal morphism $uw \mapsto vw$ (for all $w \in A^*$).

Case (1): $\mathsf{Dom}(\varphi) \not\equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Dom}(\psi)$.

Then there exists $x_1 \in A^*$ such that x_1A^* intersects $\mathsf{Dom}(\varphi)$ (e.g., at x_0), but x_1A^* does not intersect $\mathsf{Dom}(\psi)$. Then $x_0A^* \subseteq \mathsf{Dom}(\varphi)$, but $\mathsf{Dom}(\psi) \cap x_0A^* = \varnothing$. Or, vice versa, there exists $x_0 \in A^*$ such that $x_0A^* \subseteq \mathsf{Dom}(\psi)$, but $\mathsf{Dom}(\varphi) \cap x_0A^* = \varnothing$. Let us assume the former.

Letting $\beta = (x_0 \leftarrow x_0)$, we have $\varphi\,\beta(.) = (\varphi(x_0) \leftarrow x_0)$. But $\psi\,\beta(.) = 0$, since $x_0A^* \cap \mathsf{Dom}(\psi) = \varnothing$. So, $[\varphi\,\beta]_{\mathsf{end}} \cong [\psi\,\beta]_{\mathsf{end}} = \mathbf{0}$, but $[\varphi\,\beta]_{\mathsf{end}} \neq \mathbf{0}$. Hence, applying case (0) to $\Phi = [\varphi\,\beta]_{\mathsf{end}}$ we conclude that the entire monoid $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$ is congruent to $\mathbf{0}$.

Case (2.1): $\mathsf{Dom}(\varphi) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Dom}(\psi)$ and $\mathsf{Im}(\varphi) \not\equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Im}(\psi)$.

Then there exists $y_0 \in A^*$ such that $y_0A^* \subseteq \mathsf{Im}(\varphi)$, but $\mathsf{Im}(\psi) \cap y_0A^* = \varnothing$; or, vice versa, $y_0A^* \subseteq \mathsf{Im}(\psi)$, but $\mathsf{Im}(\varphi) \cap y_0A^* = \varnothing$. Let us assume the former.

Let $x_0 \in A^*$ be such that $y_0 = \varphi(x_0)$. Then $(y_0 \leftarrow y_0) \circ \varphi \circ (x_0 \leftarrow x_0) = (y_0 \leftarrow x_0)$. On the other hand, $(y_0 \leftarrow y_0) \circ \psi \circ (x_0 \leftarrow x_0) = \mathbf{0}$. Indeed, if $x_0A^* \cap \mathsf{Dom}(\psi) = \varnothing$ then for all $w \in A^*$: $\psi \circ (x_0 \leftarrow x_0)(x_0w) = \psi(x_0w) = \varnothing$. And if $x_0A^* \cap \mathsf{Dom}(\psi) \neq \varnothing$ then for those $w \in A^*$ such that $x_0w \in \mathsf{Dom}(\psi)$ we have $(y_0 \leftarrow y_0) \circ \psi \circ (x_0 \leftarrow x_0)(x_0w) = (y_0 \leftarrow y_0)(\psi(x_0w)) = \varnothing$, since $\mathsf{Im}(\psi) \cap y_0A^* = \varnothing$. Now case (0) applies to $\mathbf{0} \neq \Phi = [(y_0 \leftarrow y_0) \circ \varphi \circ (x_0 \leftarrow x_0)]_{\mathsf{end}} \cong \mathbf{0}$; hence all elements of $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$ are congruent to $\mathbf{0}$.

Case (2.2): $\mathsf{Dom}(\varphi) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Dom}(\psi)$ and $\mathsf{Im}(\varphi) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Im}(\psi)$.

Then we can restrict φ and ψ to $\mathsf{Dom}(\varphi) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(\psi)$ ($\equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Dom}(\varphi) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Dom}(\psi)$), by choice of representatives in $[\varphi]_{\mathsf{end}}$, respectively $[\psi]_{\mathsf{end}}$; so now $\mathsf{domC}(\varphi) = \mathsf{domC}(\psi)$. Since $\varphi \neq \psi$, there exist $x_0 \in \mathsf{domC}(\varphi) = \mathsf{domC}(\psi)$ and $y_0 \in \mathsf{imC}(\varphi)$, $y_1 \in \mathsf{imC}(\psi)$, such that $\varphi(x_0) = y_0 \neq y_1 = \psi(x_0)$. We have two subcases.

Subcase (2.2.1): y_0 and y_1 are not prefix-comparable.

Then $(y_0 \leftarrow y_0) \circ \varphi \circ (x_0 \leftarrow x_0) = (y_0 \leftarrow x_0)$.

On the other hand, $(y_0 \leftarrow y_0) \circ \psi \circ (x_0 \leftarrow x_0)(x_0w) = (y_0 \leftarrow y_0)(y_1w) = \varnothing$ for all $w \in A^*$ (since y_0 and y_1 are not prefix-comparable). So, $(y_0 \leftarrow y_0) \circ \psi \circ (x_0 \leftarrow x_0) = \mathbf{0}$. Hence case (0) applies to $\mathbf{0} \neq \Phi = [(y_0 \leftarrow y_0) \circ \varphi \circ (x_0 \leftarrow x_0)]_{\mathsf{end}} \cong \mathbf{0}$.

Subcase (2.2.2): y_0 is a prefix of y_1. (The subcase where y_1 is a prefix of y_0 is similar; and since $y_0 \neq y_1$, there is no other subcase.)

Then $y_1 \in y_0AA^*$; y_0 is a strict prefix of y_1 since $y_1 \neq y_0$. Moreover, $\mathsf{imC}(\psi) \cap y_0A^*$ contains some string y_2 besides y_1. Indeed, $y_1 \in \mathsf{imC}(\psi)$, y_0 is a prefix of y_1, so there are ends passing through both y_0 and y_1; and $\mathsf{imC}(\psi)\,A^* \cap y_0A^* \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} y_0A^*$ (because $\mathsf{Im}(\psi) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{Im}(\varphi)$), hence (since y_0 is a strict prefix of y_1) there is more than one end passing through y_0 and intersecting $\mathsf{imC}(\psi)$.

Since $y_2 = y_0v_2$ for some $v_2 \in A^*$, we have $(y_2 \leftarrow y_2) \circ \varphi \circ (x_0 \leftarrow x_0)(x_0v_2) = (y_2 \leftarrow y_2)(y_0v_2) = y_2$.

On the other hand, y_1 and y_2 are not prefix-comparable, since both belong to $\mathsf{imC}(\psi)$ (a prefix code). Hence, $(y_2 \leftarrow y_2) \circ \psi \circ (x_0 \leftarrow x_0)(x_0w) = (y_2 \leftarrow y_2)(y_1w) = \varnothing$, since y_2 and y_1 are not prefix-comparable. Thus, case (0) applies to $\mathbf{0} \neq \Phi = [(y_2 \leftarrow y_2) \circ \varphi \circ (x_0 \leftarrow x_0)]_{\mathsf{end}} \cong \mathbf{0}$. □

Proposition 2.24 *The group of units of* $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$ *is*

$$\{[f]_{\mathsf{end}} \;:\; f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}} \text{ and } f \text{ is a bijection between two essential right ideals of } A^*\}.$$

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ be a bijection between essential right ideals $R_1 = \mathsf{Dom}(f)$ and $R_2 = \mathsf{Im}(f)$. Then f is recursive, and R_1 and R_2 are decidable subsets of A^*. Hence $f^{-1} : R_2 \to R_1$ is recursive. Also, $f \circ f^{-1} = \mathbf{1}_{R_2}$, and $f^{-1} \circ f = \mathbf{1}_{R_1}$. Since R_1, R_2 are essential right ideals, $\mathbf{1}_{R_2} \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathbf{1} \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathbf{1}_{R_1}$. So, $[f]_{\mathsf{end}} \cdot [f^{-1}]_{\mathsf{end}} = [\mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{end}} = [f^{-1}]_{\mathsf{end}} \cdot [f]_{\mathsf{end}}$.

Conversely, suppose $[F]_{\mathsf{end}} \equiv_{\mathcal{H}} [\mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{end}}$ in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$, where $F \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. Then there exist decidable essential right ideals R_1, R_2, and there exist $f, f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ such that $f \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} F$, $f_2 \circ f = \mathbf{1}_{R_2}$ (since $[f]_{\mathsf{end}} \equiv_{\mathcal{L}} [\mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{end}}$), and $f \circ f_1 = \mathbf{1}_{R_1}$ (since $[f]_{\mathsf{end}} \equiv_{\mathcal{R}} [\mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{end}}$). We can choose f to be regular in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ since every $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$-class contains regular elements. Since f and $\mathbf{1}_{R_2}$ are regular, Lemma 2.20(1) implies $\mathsf{Im}(f) = R_2$. Since f and $\mathbf{1}_{R_1}$ are regular, Lemma 2.20(2) implies f is injective and $\mathsf{Dom}(f) = R_1$. Hence, f is a recursive bijection from R_1 onto R_2 (with a bijective inverse $f^{-1} \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, mapping R_2 onto R_1). □

In the definition of $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$ we can replace $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ by the monoid $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{rec}}$, defined by

$$\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{rec}} = \{f \;:\; f \text{ is a right-ideal morphism on } A^* \text{ that is partial recursive, and } \mathsf{Dom}(f) \text{ is decidable, and } f \text{ has a total recursive input-output balance}\}.$$

Proposition 2.25 *The monoid $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{rec}}/\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}/\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$ $(= \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}})$.*

Proof. The map $H : [f]_{\mathsf{end}} \longmapsto [f]_{\mathsf{end}} \cap \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{rec}}$ (for any $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$) is a bijection from $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$ onto $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{rec}}/\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$. The map H is injective because different $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$-classes are disjoint. The map is also surjective because for every $g \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{rec}}$ there exists $g_{\mathsf{pad}} \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ such that $g_{\mathsf{pad}} \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} g$. We can take g_{pad} to be the restriction of g to $\bigcup_{y \in \mathsf{domC}(g)} y\, A^{T(|y|)}\, A^*$, as in the proof of Theorem 2.22; $T(.)$ is the time-complexity of a halting Turing machine that computes g. Moreover, H is a homomorphism since $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$ is a congruence. $\square$

Question: We proved that $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$ is a congruence-simple homomorphic image of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. Does $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ have other congruence-simple homomorphic images?

3 Bounded end-equivalence

Definition 3.1 (bounded end-equivalence of sets). **(1)** *Two sets $L_1, L_2 \subset A^*$ are* boundedly end-equivalent *(denoted by $L_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} L_2$) iff $L_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} L_2$, and there exists a total function $\beta : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $x_1 \in L_1$ and $x_2 \in L_2$: $x_1 \parallel_{\mathsf{pref}} x_2$ implies $|x_1| \leq \beta(|x_2|)$ and $|x_2| \leq \beta(|x_1|)$.*

(2) *More generally, let $\mathcal{T}$ be any family of total functions $\mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that:*
- *$\mathcal{T}$ is* closed under composition*;*
- *every $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ is an increasing function, and $n \leq \tau(n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$;*
- *every $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ is* time-constructible*, i.e., $\tau(n)$ (represented in binary) is computable from n (represented by 0^n, i.e., in "unary notation") in time $\leq \tau(n)$.*

Two sets $L_1, L_2 \subset A^*$ are $\mathcal{T}$-end-equivalent *(denoted by $L_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} L_2$) iff $L_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} L_2$, and there exists a function $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ such that for all $x_1 \in L_1$ and $x_2 \in L_2$: $x_1 \parallel_{\mathsf{pref}} x_2$ implies $|x_1| \leq \tau(|x_2|)$ and $|x_2| \leq \tau(|x_1|)$.*

Note that the bounding function β for $L_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} L_2$ depends on L_1 and L_2. The only assumption on the function $\beta : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ is that it is *total* on $\mathbb{N}$; no computability assumptions are made.

Examples and counter-examples:

For any prefix code $P \subset A^*$ and any total function $\beta : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ we have $\bigcup_{x \in P} x\, A^{\beta(|x|)} \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} P$.

For the prefix codes $\{0,1\}$ and 0^*1 we have $\{0,1\} \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} 0^*1$, but $\{0,1\} \not\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} 0^*1$.

When P is a prefix code, $P \not\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} P\, A^*$; in this, $\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$ differs from $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$. And A^* is not $\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$-equivalent to itself, so $\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$ is not reflexive in general. When L is a prefix code, L is boundedly end-equivalent to itself. If L is a union of two prefix codes, then L might not be boundedly end-equivalent to itself (e.g., $\{0,1\} \cup \{0^n 1 : n \geq 0\}$). From here on we will use $\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$ only between prefix codes.

Closure of $\mathcal{T}$ under composition guarantees that $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ is transitive. Typical examples of families $\mathcal{T}$ as above are the following (where we only take those functions that are increasing and satisfy $n \leq \tau(n)$):
- $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ = the family of all total functions $\mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$. In that case, $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ is $\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$.
- rec = the family of all partial recursive functions $\mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ with decidable domain, i.e., the partial recursive functions that are extendable to total recursive functions.
- $\mathsf{E3}$ = the family of all *elementary recursive functions*, i.e., level 3 of the Grzegorczyk hierarchy; these are the primitive recursive functions with size bounded by a constant iteration of exponentials.
- poly = the family of all polynomials with non-negative integer coefficients.
- lin = the family of all affine functions of the form $n \mapsto a\, n + b$ (where $a \geq 1, b \geq 0$).

We have the following Cantor-space characterization of $\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$ between prefix codes:

Proposition 3.2 *For prefix codes $P_1, P_2 \subset A^*$ we have $P_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} P_2$ iff $\mathsf{ends}(P_1) = \mathsf{ends}(P_2)$.*

Proof. [$\Leftarrow$] If $\mathsf{ends}(P_1) = \mathsf{ends}(P_2)$ then by applying closure we obtain $P_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P_2$ (by Prop. 2.5). To prove boundedness of this end-equivalence, let $x_1 \in P_1$, $x_2 \in P_2$ be such that $x_1 \parallel_{\mathsf{pref}} x_2$. Let us assume x_1 is a prefix of x_2 (if x_2 is a prefix of x_1 the reasoning is symmetric). The existence of a total function $\beta\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that $|x_2| \leq \beta(|x_1|)$ for every x_2 that has x_1 as a prefix, is equivalent to the finiteness of $x_1A^* \cap P_2$ for every $x_1 \in P_1$. Indeed, the lengths of the words in a set $S \subseteq A^*$ (over a finite alphabet A) are bounded iff that set S is finite.

Since $\mathsf{ends}(P_1) = \mathsf{ends}(P_2)$, every end that passes through x_1 (i.e., that belongs to the subtree x_1A^* of A^*) intersects P_2. Hence, the tree $x_1A^* - P_2A^+ = (x_1A^* - P_2A^*) \cup (P_2 \cap x_1A^*)$ has no infinite path. By the König Infinity Lemma, this implies that this tree is finite. Hence $x_1A^* \cap P_2$, which is the set of leaves of this finite tree, is finite.

[$\Rightarrow$] If $P_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} P_2$ with bounding function $\beta\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, consider $x_1w \in \mathsf{ends}(P_1)$, with $x_1 \in P_1$ and $w \in A^\omega$. If x_1 has a prefix $x_2 \in P_2$ then obviously, $x_1w \in \mathsf{ends}(P_2)$.

Let us assume next that x_1 does not have a prefix in P_2; we want to show that in this case too, $x_1w \in \mathsf{ends}(P_2)$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let w_n be the prefix of length n of w. Since $P_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P_2$, every right ideal $x_1w_nA^*$ intersects P_2A^*; so, $x_1w_nu_n = x_2v_n$ for some $x_2 \in P_2$ and some $u_n, v_n \in A^*$. It follows that $x_1 \parallel_{\mathsf{pref}} x_2$, hence x_1 is a prefix of x_2 (since we assumed that x_1 does not have a prefix in P_2). Hence, $|x_2| \leq \beta(|x_1|)$. It also follows from $x_1w_nu_n = x_2v_n$ that $x_1w_n \parallel_{\mathsf{pref}} x_2$, so either x_1w_n is a prefix of x_2, or x_2 is a prefix of x_1w_n (while x_1 is also a prefix of x_2).

Case 1: x_1w_n is a prefix of x_2. Then $|x_2| \geq |x_1| + n$. If we choose n so that $n > \beta(|x_1|)$, this case is ruled out.

Case 2: x_2 is a prefix of x_1w_n. Then x_2 is a vertex on the end x_1w (between x_1 and x_1w_n), hence x_1w is equal to an end through x_2, so $x_1w \in \mathsf{ends}(P_2)$. $\square$

Remarks:
(1) Prop. 3.2 was proved for prefix codes. When $P_1, P_2 \subseteq A^*$ are not prefix codes, the proposition does not always hold. E.g., $A^* \not\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} A^*$ (non-reflexivity, as we saw), but obviously $\mathsf{ends}(A^*) = \mathsf{ends}(A^*)$.

One could argue that $\mathsf{ends}(L_1) = \mathsf{ends}(L_2)$ is the more reasonable definition of "$L_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} L_2$". But our definition of $\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$ (Def. 3.1) has the advantage of generalizing to $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$.

In any case, since we will use $\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$ only with prefix codes, the question doesn't matter in this paper.
(2) The relation $\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$ can be generalized to a pre-order, denoted by $\subseteq_{\mathsf{bd}}$: For prefix codes $P_1, P_2 \subset A^*$ we define $P_1 \subseteq_{\mathsf{bd}} P_2$ iff $\mathsf{ends}(P_1) \subseteq \mathsf{ends}(P_2)$. Equivalently, $P_1 \subseteq_{\mathsf{bd}} P_2$ iff there exists $Q \subseteq P_2$ such that $P_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} Q$. Similarly, $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ can be generalized by defining $P_1 \subseteq_{\mathcal{T}} P_2$ iff there exists $Q \subseteq P_2$ such that $P_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} Q$.

Notation: For any right ideal $R \subseteq A^*$, the prefix code that generates R (as a right ideal) is denoted by $\mathsf{prefC}(P)$.

Proposition 3.3 *For any prefix code $P \subset A^*$, we have:*

$$\bigcap \{\mathsf{ends}(Q) : Q \text{ is a prefix code and } Q \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} P\} \;=\; \varnothing,$$

$$\bigcap \{QA^* : Q \text{ is a prefix code and } Q \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} P\} \;=\; \varnothing,$$

$$\mathsf{prefC}\big(\bigcup \{QA^* : Q \text{ is a prefix code and } Q \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} P\}\big) \;\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}\; P\ .$$

Proof. For the intersection results this is similar to the proof of Prop. 2.7. For the union of the QA^* we have by Prop. 2.7, $\mathsf{prefC}\big(\bigcup_{Q \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} P} QA^*\big) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P$. Also, by Prop. 3.2, $\mathsf{ends}(QA^*) = \mathsf{ends}(P)$ for every prefix code Q such that $Q \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} P$; hence, $\mathsf{ends}\big(\bigcup_{Q \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} P} QA^*\big) = \mathsf{ends}(P)$. Then the result follows by Prop. 3.2. $\square$

Definition 3.4 (bounded end-equivalence of functions). *Two right-ideal morphisms f, g are* boundedly end-equivalent *(denoted by $f \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} g$) iff $\mathsf{domC}(f) \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} \mathsf{domC}(g)$, and $f(x) = g(x)$ for all $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(g)$. Equivalently, $f \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} g$ iff $f \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} g$ and $\mathsf{domC}(f) \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} \mathsf{domC}(g)$.*

For any family $\mathcal{T}$ of total functions as in Def. 3.1 we define: $f \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} g$ iff $f \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} g$ and $\mathsf{domC}(f) \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} \mathsf{domC}(g)$.

Notation: When $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, the $\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$-class in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ of f is denoted by $[f]_{\mathsf{bd}}$. So, $[f]_{\mathsf{bd}} = \{g \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}} : g \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} f\}$. More generally, $[f]_{\mathcal{T}}$ denotes the $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$-class in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ of f. Note that $[f]_{\mathsf{bd}}$ and $[f]_{\mathcal{T}}$ only contain elements of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$.

For the rest of this Section we study $\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$. The relations $\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}}$ and $\equiv_{\mathsf{E3}}$ will be investigated in the next Section.

Proposition 3.5 *(1) Let $P_1, P_2 \subset A^*$ be prefix codes such that $P_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} P_2$, let $P_\cap$ be the prefix code that generates the right ideal $P_1A^* \cap P_2A^*$, and let $P_\cup$ be the prefix code that generates the right ideal $P_1A^* \cup P_2A^*$. Then $P_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} P_2 \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} P_\cap \ \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} P_\cup$.*
(2) Let f_1, f_2 be right-ideal morphisms such that $f_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} f_2$. Then $f_1 \cap f_2$ and $f_1 \cup f_2$ are right-ideal morphisms, and $f_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} f_2 \ \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} \ f_1 \cap f_2 \ \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} \ f_1 \cup f_2$.

Proof. (1) This follows from Prop. 3.2, since $\mathsf{ends}(P_1A^* \cap P_2A^*) = \mathsf{ends}(P_1) \cap \mathsf{ends}(P_2)$ and $\mathsf{ends}(P_1A^* \cup P_2A^*) = \mathsf{ends}(P_1) \cup \mathsf{ends}(P_2)$.
For (2) the proof is similar to the proof of Prop. 2.9. $\square$

Just as for $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$ (see Def. 2.12), we define a maximum extension within a $\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$-class or a $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$-class.

Definition 3.6 *For any right-ideal morphism $f : A^* \to A^*$ we define*

$$f_{\mathsf{b,max}} \ = \ \bigcup \{g : g \text{ is a right-ideal morphism with } g \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} f\}.$$

For a family $\mathcal{T}$ of functions as in Def. 3.1 we define

$$f_{\mathcal{T},\mathsf{max}} \ = \ \bigcup \{g : g \text{ is a right-ideal morphism with } g \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} f\}.$$

Then, just as in Prop. 2.13, we have:

Proposition 3.7.
(1) For every right-ideal morphism f, $f_{\mathsf{b,max}}$ is a function, and a right-ideal morphism $A^* \to A^*$. Moreover, $f \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} f_{\mathsf{b,max}}$.
(2) For any right-ideal morphisms f, g we have: $g \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} f$ iff $g_{\mathsf{b,max}} = f_{\mathsf{b,max}}$.

Proof. The same proof as for Prop. 2.13 works here (using Prop. 3.5 and Prop. 3.3). $\square$

Recall the action of a right-ideal morphism $f : A^* \to A^*$ on A^ω: For any $p \in \mathsf{domC}(f)$ and $w \in A^\omega$, we define $f(pw) = f(p)\, w$. The domain of the action of f on A^ω is $\mathsf{domC}(f)\ A^\omega$. Accordingly, $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ acts on A^ω (non-faithfully). We have the following characterization of $\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$ in terms of the Cantor space:

Corollary 3.8 *Two right-deal morphisms $f, g : A^* \to A^*$ have the same action on A^ω iff $g \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} f$. Hence on A^ω: $g_{\mathsf{b,max}} \circ f_{\mathsf{b,max}} = (g \circ f)_{\mathsf{b,max}}$.*

The relation $\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$ is a congruence *on the monoid of all right-ideal morphisms of A^*, and in particular on $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$.*

Proof. If $g \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} f$ then $\mathsf{domC}(g) \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} \mathsf{domC}(f)$, hence by Prop. 3.2: $\mathsf{ends}(\mathsf{domC}(g)) = \mathsf{ends}(\mathsf{domC}(f))$. So the actions of f and g on A^ω have the same domain. Since $g \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} f$, the functions f and g agree on their common domain in A^ω, so they have the same action on A^ω.

Conversely, if f and g act in the same way on A^ω then $\mathsf{ends}(\mathsf{domC}(g)) = \mathsf{ends}(\mathsf{domC}(f))$, so $\mathsf{domC}(g) \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} \mathsf{domC}(f)$ (by Prop. 3.2). Also, if f and g act in the same way on A^ω then for all $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(g)$ and for all $w \in A^\omega$: $f(xw) = g(xw)$. Hence (since $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(g)$), $f(x) = g(x)$. So, f and g agree on $\mathsf{Dom}(f) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(g)$, hence $f \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} g$.

The rest of the corollary follows now. $\square$

Proposition 3.9 *There exists $g \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{rec}}$ such that $\mathsf{Dom}(g_{\mathsf{b,max}})$ is undecidable; so $g_{\mathsf{b,max}} \notin \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{rec}}$. Moreover, this function g can be chosen so that in addition we have $g_{\mathsf{b,max}} = g_{\mathsf{e,max}}$.*

Proof. Let $L \subset 0^*$ (over the one-letter alphabet $\{0\}$) be an r.e. language that is undecidable. We assume in addition that for all $0^i, 0^j \in L$ we have $|i-j| > 2$ (if $i \neq j$). Let M be a deterministic Turing machine that accepts L. Let $T(0^n)$ be the running time of M on input $0^n \in L$; $T(w)$ is undefined for $w \in \{0,1\}^* - L$. We define the right-ideal morphism g by

$$\mathsf{domC}(g) \;=\; \bigcup_{0^n \in L} 0^n\ \{0,1\}\ 1\ \{0,1\}^{T(0^n)},$$
$$g(0^n a 1 z) \;=\; 0^n\ \overline{a}\ 1 z,$$

if $0^n \in L$, $a \in \{0,1\}$, and $z \in \{0,1\}^{T(0^n)}\{0,1\}^*$. Here $\overline{a}$ denotes the complement of a (i.e., $\overline{0} = 1$, $\overline{1} = 0$). Then $g \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. We consider the following right-ideal morphism h, which extends g:

$$\mathsf{domC}(h) \;=\; L\ \{0,1\}\ 1,$$
$$h(0^n a 1) \;=\; 0^n\ \overline{a}\ 1,$$

if $0^n \in L$, $a \in \{0,1\}$.

We claim that $h = g_{\mathsf{b,max}} = g_{\mathsf{e,max}}$. Indeed, we have $h \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} g$, since $\mathsf{ends}(\mathsf{domC}(g)) = L\,\{0,1\}\,1\,\{0,1\}^\omega = \mathsf{ends}(\mathsf{domC}(h)))$ (using Prop. 3.2). And h cannot be further extended to a right-ideal morphism that is $\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} h$ (because h permutes 0^n01, 0^n11).

Also, $\mathsf{cl}(\mathsf{ends}(\mathsf{domC}(h))) \;=\; L\,\{0,1\}\,1\,\{0,1\}^\omega \;\cup\; \{0^\omega\}$. But h cannot be extended to any prefix 0^i ($i \in \mathbb{N}$) of 0^ω (again because h permutes 0^n01, 0^n11). So, h is also the maximal $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$-equivalent extension of g. $\square$

Lemma 3.10 *For every right-ideal morphisms f and g such that $f \subseteq g$ and $f \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} g$ we have:*

(1) For all $x \in \mathsf{domC}(g)$: $xA^* \cap \mathsf{domC}(f)$ is finite.

(2) For any $x \in \mathsf{domC}(g)$, f can be extended to a right-ideal morphism whose domain code is $(\mathsf{domC}(f) - xA^*) \cup \{x\}$ (this is called a one-point extension *of f).*
If $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ then this extension is also in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$.

(3) For any finite *subset $C \subset \mathsf{domC}(g)$, f can be extended to a right-ideal morphism whose domain code includes C (this is called a* finite extension *of f).*
This extension belongs to $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ if $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$.

(4) Items (1), (2), (3) hold in particular when $g = f_{\mathsf{b,max}}$.

(5) There exist $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ such that for some $x \in \mathsf{domC}(f_{\mathsf{e,max}})$ the set $xA^* \cap \mathsf{domC}(f)$ is infinite.

Proof. (1) Let $\beta(.)$ be the bounding function that corresponds to $f \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} g$. Then the tree

$$T_{x,f} \;=\; \{z \in A^* : x \text{ is a prefix of } z \text{ and } z \text{ is a prefix of some word in } \mathsf{domC}(f)\}$$

has x as root and $xA^* \cap \mathsf{domC}(f)$ as set of leaves, and has depth $\leq \beta(|x|)$. Moreover, the degree of each vertex is ≤ 2. Hence the tree $T_{x,f}$ and its set of leaves $xA^* \cap \mathsf{domC}(f)$ are finite.
(2) Since $f \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} g$ and $f \subseteq g$, every end that starts at x intersects $\mathsf{domC}(f)$. Since g and f agree on $\mathsf{domC}(f)$, f can be extended from $\mathsf{Dom}(f)$ to $(xA^* \cap \mathsf{domC}(f)) \cup \mathsf{Dom}(f)$. For domain codes, the effect of this extension is to replace $xA^* \cap \mathsf{domC}(f)$ by $\{x\}$.

If $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ then the one-point extension is also in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, since $xA^* \cap \mathsf{domC}(f)$ is finite.
(3) follows from (2).
(4) Recall that $f \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} f_{\mathsf{b,max}}$, by Prop. 3.7.(1); hence the Lemma applies to the maximum $\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$-equivalent extension $f_{\mathsf{b,max}}$.
(5) For $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$ and $f_{\mathsf{e,max}}$ the situation is different. E.g., when $f = \mathbf{1}|_{0^*1}$, we have $f_{\mathsf{e,max}} = \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathsf{domC}(f_{\mathsf{e,max}}) = \{\varepsilon\}$. Then for $x = \varepsilon$ we have $x\,\{0,1\}^* \cap \mathsf{domC}(f) = 0^*1$, which is infinite. $\square$

By Lemma 3.10, $f_{\mathsf{b,max}}$ can be constructed from f by an ω-sequence of one-point extensions.

On the other hand, the example $f = \mathbf{1}|_{0^*1}$ shows that a right-ideal morphism f might be extendable (to $\mathbf{1} \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f$ in this example), without being finitely extendable. So, in general, $f_{\mathsf{e,max}}$ cannot be obtained from f by an ω-sequence of finite extensions.

The following consequence of the Lemma is a little surprising.

Proposition 3.11 *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be any family of functions as in Def. 3.1 such that, in addition,* $\mathsf{poly} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$. *Then for every right-ideal morphism f, $f_{\mathcal{T},\mathsf{max}} = f_{\mathsf{b,max}}$.*

In particular, $f_{\mathsf{poly,max}} = f_{\mathsf{b,max}}$.

Proof. Since $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ implies $\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$, $f_{\mathcal{T},\mathsf{max}} \subseteq f_{\mathsf{b,max}}$.

On the other hand let $x \in \mathsf{domC}(f_{\mathsf{b,max}})$. Since $f \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} f_{\mathcal{T},\mathsf{max}} \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} f_{\mathsf{b,max}}$, if we let $F = f_{\mathcal{T},\mathsf{max}}$ we have $f_{\mathsf{b,max}} = F_{\mathsf{b,max}}$. By Lemma 3.10, for every $x \in \mathsf{domC}(F_{\mathsf{b,max}})$: $xA^* \cap \mathsf{domC}(F)$ is finite, and F can be extended to a right-ideal morphism F_0 which is defined on x. Since $xA^* \cap \mathsf{domC}(F)$ is finite, $F_0 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} F$. But since F is already $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$-maximum, the extension F_0 of F is F itself. So, $F(x) = F_0(x) = f_{\mathsf{b,max}}(x)$. Since this holds for every $x \in \mathsf{domC}(f_{\mathsf{b,max}})$, it follows that $F = f_{\mathsf{b,max}}$. □

Proposition 3.12 *For a right-ideal morphism f, the following are equivalent:*
(1) f is finitely extendable, to a strictly larger domain;
(2) there exist $x_0, y_0 \in A^*$ such that $(x_0 0,\, y_0 0)$, $(x_0 1,\, y_0 1) \in f$;
(3) $f \neq f_{\mathsf{b,max}}$.

Proof. The implication (2)⇒(1) is clear, since $(x_0 0,\, y_0 0)$, $(x_0 1,\, y_0 1) \in f$ implies that f can be extended to $f \cup \{(x_0, y_0)\}$. And (1) implies that $f \subsetneqq f \cup \{(x_0, y_0)\} \subseteq f_{\mathsf{b,max}}$, so (3) holds. Let us prove that that (3) implies (2). By (3), there exists $x \in A^*$ such that $x \in \mathsf{domC}(f_{\mathsf{b,max}})$ but $x \notin \mathsf{domC}(f)$. By Lemma 3.10, then $xA^* \cap \mathsf{domC}(f)$ is finite. Hence, f is finitely extendable. Moreover, a finite extension can be built out of a finite number of extensions as in item (2), so condition (2) holds. □

We mention the following, which will however not be used in this paper:

Fact. *For every $f \in \mathsf{fP}$, the encoded right-ideal morphism f^C is not finitely extendable, and not infinitely extendable. In other words, $f^C = (f^C)_{\mathsf{b,max}} = (f^C)_{\mathsf{e,max}}$.*

Proof. The encoding f^C was defined in the Introduction. It follows from that definition that $\mathsf{domC}(f^C) \subseteq \{0,1\}^* 11$, so we never have $z0, z1 \in \mathsf{domC}(f^C)$ for any $z \in A^*$. Hence, by Prop. 3.12, f^C is not finitely extendable, so $f^C = (f^C)_{\mathsf{b,max}}$.

Proof that f^C is not infinitely extendable: Let $P \subset A^*$ be any prefix code such that $\mathsf{domC}(f^C) \subseteq PA^*$ and $\mathsf{domC}(f^C) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P$; we want to show that $P = \mathsf{domC}(f^C)$, which means that f^C cannot be extended to a larger domain. Let us abbreviate $\mathsf{domC}(f^C)$ by D.

Since $P \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} D$ we have (by Lemma 2.3): $(\forall p \in P)(\exists x11 \in D)[\, p \parallel_{\mathsf{pref}} x11\,]$; moreover, since $D \subset PA^*$, this p is a prefix of $x11$. Hence, since $D \subset \{00,01\}^* 11$, we conclude that $p \in \{00,01\}^* \cdot \{\varepsilon, 1, 11\}$; i.e., for each $p \in P$ we have three possibilities: $p \in \{00,01\}^*$, $p \in \{00,01\}^* 1$, $p \in \{00,01\}^* 11$.

Claim 1. If $p \in \{00,01\}^* 11$ then $p \in D$.

Proof. Since p is a prefix of a word $x11 \in D$, and $p \in \{00,01\}^* 11$, we conclude $p = x11$ (since $\{00,01\}^* 11$ is a prefix code). [End, proof of Claim 1.]

Claim 2. $P \cap \{00,01\}^* 1 = \varnothing$; i.e., p cannot be in $\{00,01\}^* 1$.

Proof. If there exists $p \in P \cap \{00,01\}^* 1$ and p is a prefix of some $x11 \in \{00,01\}^* 11$, then $p = x1$. But then $P \not\equiv_{\mathsf{end}} D$, since the right ideal $p0A^* = x10A^* \subseteq \{00,01\}^* 10\, A^*$ intersects PA^* but not $\{00,01\}^* 11\, A^*$. [End, proof of Claim 2.]

Claim 3. $P \cap \{00,01\}^* = \varnothing$; i.e., p cannot be in $\{00,01\}^*$.

Proof. Assume there exists $p \in P \cap \{00,01\}^*$ such that p is a prefix of some $x11 \in \{0,1\}^* 11$. But then $P \not\equiv_{\mathsf{end}} D$, since the right ideal $p10A^* = x10A^* \subseteq \{00,01\}^* 10\, A^*$ intersects PA^* but not $\{00,01\}^* 11\, A^*$. [End, proof of Claim 3.]

We are left with only case 1, i.e., $P \subseteq D$. Hence $P = D$, since $D \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P$. $\square$

Notation: The quotient monoid for the action of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ on A^ω is $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}/\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$; it will also be denoted by $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}}$.

Recall that $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{rec}}$ consists of all right-ideal morphisms that are partial recursive with decidable domain, and that have a total recursive input-output balance.

Proposition 3.13 *The monoid $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{rec}}/\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}/\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$ $(= \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}})$.*

Proof. This is proved in the same way as Prop. 2.25. $\square$

Lemma 3.14 *If P, Q are prefix codes such that $P \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} Q$, and if P is finite, then Q is finite.*

Proof. Let β be the length-bounding (total) function associated with $P \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} Q$. Since $P \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} Q$, every element $x_2 \in Q$ is prefix-comparable to some $x_1 \in P$. Since P is finite, the elements of P can have only finitely many prefixes, hence the set of elements of Q that are prefixes of some element(s) of P is finite. Moreover, each $x_1 \in P$ can be the prefix of only finitely many $x_2 \in Q$, since every such x_2 has length $\leq \beta(|x_1|)$. Since P is finite, the set of length bounds $\{\beta(|x_1|) : x_1 \in P\}$ is finite. Hence Q is finite. $\square$

Theorem 3.15.
(1) The monoid $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}}$ is regular, $\mathcal{J}^0$-simple, and finitely generated.
(2) For any family $\mathcal{T}$ of total functions as in Def. 3.1, the group of units of $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathcal{T}}$ is the Richard Thompson group V (a.k.a. $G_{2,1}$).
(3) For $\mathcal{T}$ as in (2), $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathcal{T}}$ is not congruence-simple.

Proof. (1) Regularity and finite generation are proved in the same way as for $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$ (Theorem 2.22). Since $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is $\mathcal{J}^0$-simple, so is its homomorphic image $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}/\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$ $(= \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}})$.

(2) By definition, $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ implies $\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$. By Lemma 3.14, if $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ has a finite $\mathsf{domC}(f)$ then every element of $[f]_{\mathcal{T}}$ has a finite domain code, so the congruence $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ coincides with the Thompson congruence on functions with finite domain code. Thus, V is a subgroup of the group of units.

Conversely, suppose $[F]_{\mathcal{T}} \equiv_{\mathcal{H}} [\mathbf{1}]_{\mathcal{T}}$ in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathcal{T}}$, where $F \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. We note first that if $e \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ satisfies $e \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{1}$, then $e = \mathbf{1}_{PA^*}$, for some maximal prefix code $P \subset A^*$ in P. Now $[F]_{\mathcal{T}} \equiv_{\mathcal{H}} [\mathbf{1}]_{\mathcal{T}}$ implies that there is a maximal prefix code $P_2 \subset A^*$ in P such that $\mathbf{1}_{P_2A^*} \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{1}$, and there exists $g_2 \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ such that $g_2 \circ F = \mathbf{1}_{P_2A^*}$ (since $[F]_{\mathcal{T}} \equiv_{\mathcal{L}} [\mathbf{1}]_{\mathcal{T}}$). Then, $\mathbf{1}_{P_2A^*} \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{1}$ implies $F \circ \mathbf{1}_{P_2A^*} \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} F$. Letting $f = F \circ \mathbf{1}_{P_2A^*}$ $(\equiv_{\mathcal{T}} F)$, we now have $[f]_{\mathcal{T}} \equiv_{\mathcal{H}} [\mathbf{1}]_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $g_2 \circ f = \mathbf{1}_{P_2A^*}$ with $f \circ g_2 \circ f = f$. So f is regular.

We also have $f \circ g_1 = \mathbf{1}_{P_1A^*}$ (since $[f]_{\mathcal{T}} \equiv_{\mathcal{R}} [\mathbf{1}]_{\mathcal{T}}$), where $g_1 \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ and P_1 is a maximal prefix code in P. Since $\mathbf{1}_{P_1A^*} \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{1} \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{1}_{P_2A^*}$, we have $P_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} \{\varepsilon\} \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} P_2$, hence by Lemma 3.14, the prefix codes P_1 and P_2 are finite. Since f and $\mathbf{1}_{P_2A^*}$ are regular, Lemma 2.20(1) implies $\mathsf{Im}(f) = P_2A^*$. Since f and $\mathbf{1}_{P_1A^*}$ are regular, Lemma 2.20(2) implies that f is injective and $\mathsf{Dom}(f) = P_1A^*$. Hence, f is a bijection from P_1A^* onto P_2A^*, with P_1, P_2 finite. Thus, $[f]_{\mathcal{T}}$ $(= [F]_{\mathcal{T}})$ belongs to the Thompson group V (in the formulation of [6]).

(3) Obviously, the congruence $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ is a refinement of $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$, so there is a surjective homomorphism $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathcal{T}} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$. By (2) and Prop. 2.24, these two monoids have different groups of units, so they are not isomorphic, hence the above surjective homomorphism is not injective. So, $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ is a strict refinement of $\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$, so $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathcal{T}}$ is not congruence-simple. $\square$

Proposition 3.16.
(1) In $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ we have: If $\mathbf{1} \equiv_{\mathcal{D}} f$, then $\mathsf{imC}(f)$ is finite.
(2) The monoid $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is not $\mathcal{D}^0$-simple.

Proof. (1) If $\mathbf{1} \equiv_{\mathcal{D}} f$ then f is obviously regular (since $\mathbf{1}$ is regular, and the whole $\mathcal{D}$-class is regular if it contains a regular element). By definition of $\equiv_{\mathcal{D}}$, $\mathbf{1} \equiv_{\mathcal{D}} f$ iff $\mathbf{1} \equiv_{\mathcal{L}} g \equiv_{\mathcal{R}} f$ for some $g \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. By Lemma 2.20 this implies that $\mathsf{domC}(g)$ is finite (and, moreover, g is injective, and $\mathsf{domC}(g)$ is a maximal prefix code), and that $\mathsf{Im}(g) = \mathsf{Im}(f)$; hence $\mathsf{imC}(g) = \mathsf{imC}(f)$. Since $\mathsf{domC}(g)$ is finite, $\mathsf{imC}(g)$ is finite. Hence $\mathsf{imC}(f)$ $(= \mathsf{imC}(g))$ is finite.

(2) Consider $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ defined (for all $n \geq 0$) by $f(0^{2n}1) = 0^{2n+1}1$ and $f(0^{2n+1}1) = 0^{2n}1$; so, $\mathsf{domC}(f) = \mathsf{imC}(f) = 0^*1$. Then $\mathsf{imC}(f)$ is infinite, so by (1), $f \not\equiv_{\mathcal{D}} \mathbf{1}$ in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. □

Let $M_{2,1}$ denote the monoid generalization of the Thompson group V $(= G_{2,1})$; see [5].

Proposition 3.17.
(1) In $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}}$, the $\mathcal{D}$-class of the identity contains $M_{2,1} - \{\mathbf{0}\}$.
(2) In $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}}$, the $\mathcal{R}$-class of the identity contains some elements that are not in $M_{2,1}$.

Proof. (1) The monoid $M_{2,1}$ is the submonoid $\{[f]_{\mathsf{bd}} \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}} : \mathsf{domC}(f) \text{ is finite}\}$ (see [5]). In Theorem 2.5 of [5] it was proved that $M_{2,1}$ is $\mathcal{D}^0$-simple. Therefore, $M_{2,1} - \{\mathbf{0}\}$ is contained in the $\mathcal{D}$-class of $\mathbf{1}$ in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}}$.
(2) By Lemma 2.11 in [3], the $\mathcal{R}$-class of $\mathbf{1}$ in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is $\{f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}} : \varepsilon \in \mathsf{Im}(f)\}$. Consider $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ defined by $f(0^n1) = 0^n$ for all $n \geq 0$; so, $\mathsf{domC}(f) = 0^*1$ and $\mathsf{imC}(f) = \{\varepsilon\}$. Hence f is in the $\mathcal{R}$-class of $\mathbf{1}$. But $[f]_{\mathsf{bd}}$ $(\in \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}})$ does not belong to $M_{2,1}$, since the infinite prefix code 0^*1 is not $\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$-equivalent to a finite prefix code. □

Lemma 3.18 *If $R_2 \subseteq R_1$ are right ideals of A^* and R_2 is* essential*, then R_1 is also essential.*
If R_2 is essential and finitely generated *(as a right ideal), then R_1 is finitely generated.*

Proof. Every right ideal xA^* intersects R_2, hence xA^* obviously intersects R_1 (since $R_2 \subseteq R_1$). So R_1 is essential. If R_2 is a finitely generated essential right ideal then $R_2 = P_2A^*$ for a finite maximal prefix code P_2. It follows that $A^* - P_2A^*$ is a finite set. Moreover, R_1 is generated by a subset of $P_2 \cup (R_1 - P_2A^*)$. This is a subset of $P_2 \cup (A^* - P_2A^*)$, which is finite. □

Lemma 3.19 (See also Lemma 5.9.) *If $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ satisfy $f_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} f_2$, then $\mathsf{imC}(f_1) \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} \mathsf{imC}(f_2)$.*

Proof. By Prop. 3.2 and Cor. 3.8: $f_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} f_2$ iff $\mathsf{domC}(f_1)\ A^\omega = \mathsf{domC}(f_2)\ A^\omega$ and f_1, f_2 agree on $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$. Thus $f_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} f_2$ implies $\mathsf{imC}(f_1)\ A^\omega = f_1(\mathsf{domC}(f_1)\ A^\omega) = f_1(\mathsf{domC}(f_1)\ A^\omega \cap \mathsf{domC}(f_2)\ A^\omega) = f_2(\mathsf{domC}(f_1)\ A^\omega \cap \mathsf{domC}(f_2)\ A^\omega) = f_2(\mathsf{domC}(f_2)\ A^\omega) = \mathsf{imC}(f_2)\ A^\omega$. So $\mathsf{imC}(f_1)\ A^\omega = \mathsf{imC}(f_2)\ A^\omega$, hence (by Prop. 3.2 again), $\mathsf{imC}(f_1) \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} \mathsf{imC}(f_2)$. □

Notation: For any right ideal $R \subseteq A^*$, the (unique) prefix code that generates R as a right ideal is denoted by $\mathsf{prefC}(R)$.

Lemma 3.20.
(1) Let $R \subseteq A^*$ be an essential right ideal such that $R \in \mathsf{P}$. If $[\mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{bd}} \equiv_{\mathcal{D}} [\mathbf{1}_R]_{\mathsf{bd}}$ in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}}$, then R is finitely generated (as a right ideal).
(2) The monoid $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}}$ is not $\mathcal{D}^0$-simple.

Proof. (1) We have $[\mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{bd}} \equiv_{\mathcal{D}} [f]_{\mathsf{bd}}$ iff $[\mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{bd}} \equiv_{\mathcal{L}} [g]_{\mathsf{bd}} \equiv_{\mathcal{R}} [f]_{\mathsf{bd}}$ for some $g \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. The relation $[\mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{bd}} \equiv_{\mathcal{L}} [g]_{\mathsf{bd}}$ is equivalent to $[\mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{bd}} = [m]_{\mathsf{bd}}\,[g]_{\mathsf{bd}}$ for some $m \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, hence $\mathbf{1} \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} mg$. So (by Lemma 3.14), $\mathbf{1}_{PA^*} = mg$ for some finite maximal prefix code $P \subset A^*$. It follows from $\mathbf{1}_{PA^*} = mg$ that $PA^* \subseteq \mathsf{Dom}(g)$. Since PA^* is a finitely generated essential right ideal, it follows (by Lemma 3.18) that $\mathsf{Dom}(g)$ is also a finitely generated essential right ideal. In summary, so far we have shown that $[\mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{bd}} \equiv_{\mathcal{L}} [g]_{\mathsf{bd}} \equiv_{\mathcal{R}} [f]_{\mathsf{bd}}$, where g is such that

$\mathsf{domC}(g)$ is a finite maximal prefix code.

We are interested in the case when $f = \mathbf{1}_R$, where $R \subset A^*$ is an essential right ideal with $[\mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{bd}} \equiv_{\mathcal{D}} [\mathbf{1}_R]_{\mathsf{bd}}$. Then $[\mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{bd}} \equiv_{\mathcal{L}} [g]_{\mathsf{bd}} \equiv_{\mathcal{R}} [f]_{\mathsf{bd}}$, with g as above. The relation $[g]_{\mathsf{bd}} \equiv_{\mathcal{R}} [\mathbf{1}_R]_{\mathsf{bd}}$ implies that $\mathbf{1}_R \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} gh$ for some $h \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. And this implies that $\mathbf{1}_{R_1} = gh$ for some right ideal R_1 such that $\mathsf{prefC}(R_1) \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} \mathsf{prefC}(R)$; hence, R_1 is essential (since R is essential). From $\mathbf{1}_{R_1} = gh$ it follows that $R_1 \subseteq \mathsf{Im}(g)$; this implies that $\mathsf{Im}(g)$ is essential (by Lemma 3.18). Moreover, since $\mathsf{Dom}(g)$ is finitely generated (as we saw above), $g(\mathsf{Dom}(g)) = \mathsf{Im}(g)$ is finitely generated. So, $\mathsf{Im}(g)$ is a finitely generated essential right ideal, i.e.,

$\mathsf{imC}(g)$ is a finite maximal prefix code.

The relation $[g]_{\mathsf{bd}} \equiv_{\mathcal{R}} [\mathbf{1}_R]_{\mathsf{bd}}$ also implies that $g \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} \mathbf{1}_R \cdot k'$ for some $k' \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$; let $g'_1 = \mathbf{1}_R \cdot k'$. Let $g_1 = g'_1 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Dom}(g)}$; hence $\mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Dom}(g_1)} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Dom}(g'_1)} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Dom}(g)} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Dom}(g)} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Dom}(g'_1)}$. And let $k = k' \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Dom}(g_1)}$. Multiplying $g \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} g'_1 = \mathbf{1}_R \cdot k'$ on the right by $\mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Dom}(g)}$ yields:

$$g \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} g_1 = \mathbf{1}_R \cdot k' \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Dom}(g)},$$

and then multiplying this on the right by $\mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Dom}(g'_1)}$ yields

$$(g \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}) \; g_1 = \mathbf{1}_R \cdot k' \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Dom}(g)} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Dom}(g'_1)},$$

since $\mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Dom}(g'_1)}$ and $\mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Dom}(g)}$ commute, and since $\mathsf{Dom}(g_1) \subseteq \mathsf{Dom}(g'_1)$. Moreover,

$$k' \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Dom}(g'_1)} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Dom}(g)} = k' \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Dom}(g_1)} = k.$$

Thus we have $g_1 = \mathbf{1}_R \cdot k$; this implies $\mathsf{Im}(g_1) \subseteq R$. Since $g \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} g_1$, and $\mathsf{Im}(g)$ is essential (as we saw above), Lemma 3.19 implies that $\mathsf{Im}(g_1)$ is also essential. And since $\mathsf{Dom}(g)$ is finitely generated (as we saw above), and $g \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} g_1$, it follows that $\mathsf{Dom}(g_1)$ is finitely generated (by Lemma 3.14). Hence, $\mathsf{Im}(g_1) = g_1(\mathsf{Dom}(g_1))$ is finitely generated. So now we have $\mathsf{Im}(g_1) \subseteq R$ (seen above), where $\mathsf{Im}(g_1)$ is an essential right ideal that is finitely generated. By Lemma 3.18, it follows that R is finitely generated.

(2) Let R be an essential right ideal in P such that $\mathsf{prefC}(R)$ is infinite. Such right ideals exist; examples are 0^*1A^*, $0^*10^*A^*$, and $\{00, 11\}^*1A^*$. Then by (1), $[\mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{bd}} \not\equiv_{\mathcal{D}} [\mathbf{1}_R]_{\mathsf{bd}}$. □

We can now completely characterize the $\mathcal{D}$-relation in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}}$:

Theorem 3.21 *The monoid $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}}$ has exactly two non-zero $\mathcal{D}$-classes, namely*

$D_1 = \{[f]_{\mathsf{bd}} : [f]_{\mathsf{bd}}$ contains $f \neq 0$ such that $\mathsf{imC}(f)$ is finite$\}$ *and*

$D_2 = \{[f]_{\mathsf{bd}} : [f]_{\mathsf{bd}}$ contains f such that $\mathsf{imC}(f)$ is infinite$\}$.

Proof. The sets D_1 and D_2 are disjoint, and form a bipartition of $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}} - \{[\mathbf{0}]_{\mathsf{bd}}\}$. Indeed, if $g \in [f]_{\mathsf{bd}}$ then $\mathsf{imC}(g) \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} \mathsf{imC}(f)$ (by Lemma 3.19); and finiteness of $\mathsf{imC}(f)$ implies finiteness of $\mathsf{imC}(g)$ (by Prop. 3.14). Thus, if $[f]_{\mathsf{bd}} \in D_1$ then all elements of $[f]_{\mathsf{bd}}$ have finite image code, so $[f]_{\mathsf{bd}} \notin D_2$.

Also, $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}}$ is not $\mathcal{D}^0$-simple (by Lemma 3.20(2)), hence $D_1 \cup D_2$ is not one $\mathcal{D}$-class. So we just need to prove that all elements in D_1 are $\mathcal{D}$-related, and all elements in D_2 are $\mathcal{D}$-related.

(1) Let us prove that all elements of D_1 are $\mathcal{D}$-related.

Every element of $[\mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{bd}}$ is of the form $\mathbf{1}_{PA^*}$, where P is a maximal prefix code, and by Lemma 3.14, P is finite. By Lemma 2.20, if $g \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is injective and $\mathsf{domC}(g)$ is a finite maximal prefix code, then $g \equiv_{\mathcal{L}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{domC}(g)\,A^*}$, hence $[g]_{\mathsf{bd}} \equiv_{\mathcal{L}} [\mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{bd}}$ (in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}}$). For any $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ with finite $\mathsf{imC}(f)$, we want to show that $f \equiv_{\mathcal{R}} g$ in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ for some g of the above type; then we will have $[f]_{\mathsf{bd}} \equiv_{\mathcal{R}} [g]_{\mathsf{bd}} \equiv_{\mathcal{L}} [\mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{bd}}$ in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}}$.

Let $\mathsf{imC}(f) = \{y_i : i = 1, \ldots, N\}$, where $N = |\mathsf{imC}(f)|$ (finite). Let $X = \{x_i : i = 1, \ldots, N\} \subseteq \mathsf{domC}(f)$ be such that $x_i \in f^{-1}(y_i)$; i.e., X is a choice set for the restriction of f^{-1} to $\mathsf{imC}(f)$. Since $X \subseteq \mathsf{domC}(f)$, X is a finite prefix code. Let $P \subset A^*$ be any finite maximal prefix code of size N, and let $(p_1, \ldots, p_N)$ be any total ordering of P. We define an injective right-ideal morphism $\alpha \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ by $\mathsf{domC}(\alpha) = P$, $\mathsf{imC}(\alpha) = X$, and $\alpha(p_i w) = x_i w$ (for all $i = 1, \ldots, N$, and $w \in A^*$).

Let $g = f \circ \alpha$. So, $\mathsf{domC}(g) = P$ (which is a finite maximal prefix code), and $\mathsf{imC}(g) = \mathsf{imC}(f)$. And g, restricted to $\mathsf{domC}(g)$, is a bijection from P to $\mathsf{imC}(f)$, so g is injective on $\mathsf{Dom}(g) = PA^*$. (In fact,

$[g]_{\mathsf{bd}} \in M_{2,1}$, the Thompson-Higman monoid defined in [5]).) Let $\beta = g^{-1} \circ f$; this is well defined since g is injective. Note that $g \circ g^{-1}$ is the restriction of the identity map to $\mathsf{imC}(f)$ $A^* = \mathsf{Im}(f) = \mathsf{Im}(g)$; thus, $g \circ \beta = g \circ g^{-1} \circ f = \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Im}(f)} \circ f = f$. Thus, $g = f \circ \alpha$ and $g \circ \beta = f$, so $g \equiv_{\mathcal{R}} f$ in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$.

(2) Let us prove that all elements of D_2 are $\mathcal{D}$-related.

By Prop. 3.13, $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}}$ $(= \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}/\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}})$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{rec}}/\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$.

Claim 1: Let $P, Q \subset A^*$ be prefix codes that are infinite and decidable. Then there exists a bijection $\alpha \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{rec}}$ from P onto Q.

Proof: For any infinite set $S \subseteq A^*$, the rank function of S is a bijection from S onto $\mathbb{N}$, defined for $x \in S$ by $\mathsf{rank}_S(x) = |\{w \in S : w <_{\mathrm{llex}} x\}|$. To make $\mathsf{rank}_S(.)$ a function between words, we represent a natural integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by 0^n1, so $\mathsf{Im}(\mathsf{rank}_S) = 0^*1$. Then $\mathsf{rank}_S(.)$ has a recursive input-output balance.

If S is decidable then rank_S is partial recursive with decidable domain S. And rank_S has a computable input-output balance when S is infinite. Then $\alpha = \mathsf{rank}_Q^{-1} \circ \mathsf{rank}_P$ is a bijection from P onto Q with the claimed properties. Finally, α can be extended to a bijective right-ideal morphism from PA^* onto QA^*; thus, $\alpha \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{rec}}$. This proves Claim 1.

As a consequence of the proof of Claim 1, $\mathbf{1}_{PA^*} = \alpha \circ \mathbf{1}_{QA^*}$ and $\mathbf{1}_{QA^*} = \alpha^{-1} \circ \mathbf{1}_{PA^*}$. Hence for all infinite decidable prefix codes P and Q we have: $\mathbf{1}_{PA^*} \equiv_{\mathcal{L}} \mathbf{1}_{QA^*}$ in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{rec}}$.

Claim 2: For any $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{rec}}$, $f \equiv_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Im}(f)}$.

Proof: For $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{rec}}$, $\mathsf{Im}(f)$ is a decidable set, because of the computable I/O-balance. Every $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{rec}}$ has an inverse in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{rec}}$, and since $\mathsf{Im}(f)$ is decidable, such an inverse can be restricted to $\mathsf{Im}(f)$. If f' is such an inverse with domain $\mathsf{Im}(f)$, we have: $f \circ f' = \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Im}(f)}$. Moreover, $\mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Im}(f)} \circ f = f$. This proves Claim 2.

By Claim 2 and the consequence of Claim 1 we now have: If $f, g \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{rec}}$ and if $\mathsf{imC}(f)$, $\mathsf{imC}(g)$ are infinite, then $f \equiv_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Im}(f)} \equiv_{\mathcal{L}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{Im}(g)} \equiv_{\mathcal{R}} g$. $\square$

4 Polynomial and exponential end-equivalences

The relations $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$, in particular $\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}}$ and $\equiv_{\mathsf{E3}}$, were defined in Def. 3.1 for prefix codes, and in Def. 3.4 for right-ideal morphisms. We call $\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}}$ the *polynomial end-equivalence* relation, and $\equiv_{\mathsf{E3}}$ the *exponential end-equivalence* (or elementary recursive end-equivalence) relation. Throughout this section, $\mathcal{T}$ denotes a family of functions as in Def. 3.1, possibly with additional properties. When $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ is applied between prefix codes, it is an equivalence relation. Transitivity follows from the fact that $\mathcal{T}$ is closed under composition. When there exists $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $|x_1| \leq \tau(|x_2|)$ and $|x_2| \leq \tau(|x_1|)$, we say that the lengths $|x_1|$ and $|x_2|$ are *$\mathcal{T}$-related*; in particular, when $\mathcal{T}$ is the set of polynomials we say *"polynomially related"*. The latter is the most interesting, due to its connections with NP.

If L_1, L_2, M_1, M_2 are prefix codes such that $L_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} L_2$, $M_1 \subseteq L_1$, $M_2 \subseteq L_2$, and $M_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} M_2$, then $M_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} M_2$. Indeed, the bounding function $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ that appear in the definition of $L_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} L_2$, also works for $M_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} M_2$.

There exists $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ such that $f(\mathsf{domC}(f)) \not\equiv_{\mathcal{T}} \mathsf{imC}(f)$, and $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ is not reflexive on $f(\mathsf{domC}(f))$. Moreover, f can be chosen so that there exist prefix codes $P_1, P_2 \subset \mathsf{Dom}(f)$ with $P_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} P_2$, such that $f(P_1) \not\equiv_{\mathcal{T}} f(P_2)$. As an example, let $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ be defined by $f(0^n1w) = 0^nw$ for all $n \geq 0$ and $w \in \{0,1\}^*$; so $\mathsf{domC}(f) = 0^*1$, and $\mathsf{imC}(f) = \{\varepsilon\}$. Then, $f(\mathsf{domC}(f)) = 0^* \not\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} \{\varepsilon\} = \mathsf{imC}(f)$, and $f(\mathsf{domC}(f)) = 0^* \not\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} 0^* = f(\mathsf{domC}(f))$ (non-reflexive). Note that $\not\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$ implies $\not\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$. To show the possibility of $f(P_1) \not\equiv_{\mathcal{T}} f(P_2)$ when $P_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} P_2$, let f be as in the example above, and let $P_1 = P_2 = 0^*1$. Then $f(P_1) = f(P_2) = 0^*$; but $0^* \not\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} 0^*$ (non-reflexivity in this case).

There exist $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ and prefix codes $P_1, P_2 \subset \mathsf{Im}(f)$ such that $P_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} P_2$ but $f^{-1}(P_1) \not\equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f^{-1}(P_2)$. For example, let $\mathsf{domC}(f) = \{00, 01, 1\}$, and $f(00) = 00$, $f(01) = 0$, $f(1) = \varepsilon$; so $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. Then $f^{-1}(\{\varepsilon\}) = \{1\}$, $f^{-1}(\{0\}) = \{01, 10\}$, $f^{-1}(\{1\}) = \{11\}$, $f^{-1}(\{01\}) = \{101, 011\}$, $f^{-1}(\{00\}) = \{100, 010, 00\}$. Let $P_1 = \{\varepsilon\}$, $P_2 = \{0, 1\}$, and $P_3 = \{00, 01, 1\}$. Then $P_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} P_2 \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} P_3$, but

$f^{-1}(P_1)$, $f^{-1}(P_2)$, and $f^{-1}(P_3)$ are all $\not\equiv_{\mathsf{end}}$, since $f^{-1}(P_1) = \{11\}$, $f^{-1}(P_2) = \{01, 10, 11\}$, and $f^{-1}(P_3) = \{11, 100, 010, 00, 101, 011\}$.

The following is the $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ version of Propositions 2.9 and 3.5.

Proposition 4.1 *For any family of functions $\mathcal{T}$, as in Def. 3.1 we have the following.*

(1) Let $P_1, P_2 \subset A^*$ be prefix codes such that $P_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} P_2$, let $P_\cap$ be the prefix code that generates the right ideal $P_1A^* \cap P_2A^*$, and let $P_\cup$ be the prefix code that generates the right ideal $P_1A^* \cup P_2A^*$. Then $P_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} P_2 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} P_\cap \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} P_\cup$.

(2) Let f_1, f_2 be right-ideal morphisms such that $f_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} f_2$. Then $f_1 \cap f_2$ and $f_1 \cup f_2$ are right-ideal morphisms, and $f_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} f_2 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} f_1 \cap f_2 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} f_1 \cup f_2$.

Proof. (1) By Prop. 2.9, $P_\cap \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P_\cup \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} P_2$.

Length bounds: It is known (and easily proved) that $P_\cup \subseteq P_1 \cup P_2$. Hence, if $x \in P_\cup$, $p_1 \in P_1$, and $x \parallel_{\mathsf{pref}} p_1$, then either $x \in P_1$ (and then $x = p_1$), or $x \in P_2$ (and then $|x|$, $|p_1|$ are τ-related since $P_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} P_2$). Similarly, if $x \in P_\cup$, $p_2 \in P_2$, and $x \parallel_{\mathsf{pref}} p_2$, then $|x|$, $|p_2|$ are τ-related.

It is also the case that $P_\cap \subseteq P_1 \cup P_2$, and a similar reasoning applies here.

(2) We conclude from (1) that $\mathsf{Dom}(f_i) \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} \mathsf{Dom}(f_1) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(f_2) \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} \mathsf{Dom}(f_1) \cup \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$, for $i = 1, 2$.

Also, $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1 \cap f_2) = \mathsf{Dom}(f_1) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$. And since $f_1 = f_2$ on $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1 \cap f_2)$ we have $f_1 = f_1 \cap f_2$ on $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1 \cap f_2)$. Hence $f_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} f_1 \cap f_2$, and similarly for f_2.

Also, $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1 \cup f_2) = \mathsf{Dom}(f_1) \cup \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$. And $f_1 = f_1 \cup f_2$ on $\mathsf{Dom}(f_1)$, and $f_2 = f_1 \cup f_2$ on $\mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$, hence $f_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} f_1 \cup f_2 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} f_2$. □

Corollary 4.2 *Every $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$-class in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is a lattice under $\subseteq$, $\cup$ and $\cap$.* □

Theorem 4.3 *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be any family of functions as in Def. 3.1. and let $\mathcal{M}$ be any monoid of right-ideal morphisms with I/O-balance function in $\mathcal{T}$. Then the relation $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ is a congruence on $\mathcal{M}$.*

Proof. Clearly, $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ is an equivalence relation (for transitivity we use the fact that $\mathcal{T}$ is closed under composition). For the multiplicative property, let $f_1, f_2, g \in \mathcal{M}$, and suppose $f_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} f_2$; we want to prove that $f_1\, g \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} f_2\, g$ and $g\, f_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} g\, f_2$. The actions of f_1 and f_2 on A^ω are the same, hence $f_1 g \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} f_2 g$, and $g f_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} g f_2$ (using Cor. 3.8). We still need to check the $\mathcal{T}$-relation for lengths on the domain codes.

- Proof that $\mathsf{domC}(f_1 g) \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} \mathsf{domC}(f_2 g)$:

Let $x_1 \in \mathsf{domC}(f_1 g)$, $x_2 \in \mathsf{domC}(f_2 g)$ be prefix-comparable. We want to show that $|x_1|$, $|x_2|$ are $\mathcal{T}$-related. By Prop. 4.1(2) we can assume that $f_2 \subseteq f_1$, hence $\mathsf{Dom}(f_2) \subseteq \mathsf{Dom}(f_1)$; hence, $x_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} x_1$ (i.e., x_1 is a prefix of x_2).

Since $x_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} x_1$, we have $g(x_2) \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} g(x_1)$. Since $x_i \in \mathsf{domC}(f_i g)$, we have $g(x_i) \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_i)$; hence there exists $z_i \in \mathsf{domC}(f_i)$ with $g(x_i) \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} z_i$ (for $i = 1, 2$). Since $z_2 \leq_{\mathsf{pref}} g(x_2) \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} g(x_1) \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} z_1$, we have $z_2 \parallel_{\mathsf{pref}} g(x_1)$ and $z_2 \parallel_{\mathsf{pref}} z_1$. Since $f_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} f_2$, $|z_1|$ and $|z_2|$ are $\mathcal{T}$-related.

Since $f_2 \subseteq f_1$, $\mathsf{Dom}(f_2) \subseteq \mathsf{Dom}(f_1)$, hence for all $d_2 \in \mathsf{domC}(f_2)$ and all $d_1 \in \mathsf{domC}(f_1)$: if $d_2 \parallel_{\mathsf{pref}} d_1$ then $d_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} d_1$; therefore, $z_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} z_1$. We now have two cases:

$g(x_2) \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} g(x_1) \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} z_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} z_1$, or

$g(x_2) \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} z_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} g(x_1) \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} z_1$.

Case 1: $g(x_1) \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} z_2$.

Now $g(x_1) \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$ (since $g(x_1) \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} z_2$), hence $x_1 \in g^{-1}(\mathsf{Dom}(f_2))$, so $x_1 \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_2 g)$. Since $x_2 \in \mathsf{domC}(f_2 g)$ and $x_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} x_1$ it follows that $x_2 = x_1$.

This implies obviously that $|x_2| = |x_1|$, hence $|x_2|$ and $|x_1|$ are $\mathcal{T}$-related.

Case 2: $z_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} g(x_1)$.

Being a right-ideal morphism of A^*, g is a one-to-one correspondence between the $\geq_{\mathsf{pref}}$-chains

$x_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} \ \ldots \ \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} x_1$ and
$g(x_2) \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} \ \ldots \ \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} g(x_1)$
in A^*. (It is easy to see that any right-ideal morphism f of A^* is injective on any chain $x >_{\mathsf{pref}} xm_1 >_{\mathsf{pref}} xm_1m_2 >_{\mathsf{pref}} \ \ldots \ >_{\mathsf{pref}} xm_1m_2\ldots m_k$, if $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f)$; this holds even if f is not injective on all of $\mathsf{Dom}(f)$.) Since $g(x_2) \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} z_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} g(x_1)$, let t_2 be the (unique) inverse image of z_2 in the upper chain; so $x_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} t_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} x_1$, and $g(t_2) = z_2$ ($\in \mathsf{domC}(f_2)$). Then $t_2 \in g^{-1}(\mathsf{domC}(f_2))$, hence $t_2 \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_2g)$. Moreover, $t_2 \leq_{\mathsf{pref}} x_2 \in \mathsf{domC}(f_2g)$ implies that $t_2 = x_2$. Therefore, $g(t_2) = g(x_2)$, hence (since $g(t_2) = z_2$), $z_2 = g(x_2)$. Thus, $g(x_2) \in \mathsf{domC}(f_2)$. Now we have $g(x_i) \in \mathsf{domC}(f_i)$ $(i = 1, 2)$, and $g(x_2) \ \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} g(x_1)$, hence (since $f_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} f_2$), $|g(x_2)|$ and $|g(x_1)|$ are $\mathcal{T}$-related. By the I/O-balance of g, $|g(x_i)|$ and $|x_i|$ are also $\mathcal{T}$-related $(i = 1, 2)$. Thus, $|x_1|$, $|x_2|$ are $\mathcal{T}$-related.

- Proof that $\mathsf{domC}(gf_1) \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} \mathsf{domC}(gf_2)$:

Let $x_1 \in \mathsf{domC}(gf_1)$, $x_2 \in \mathsf{domC}(gf_2)$ be prefix-comparable. We want to show that $|x_1|$, $|x_2|$ are $\mathcal{T}$-related. As before, we can assume that $f_2 \subseteq f_1$, hence $x_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} x_1$ (i.e., x_1 is a prefix of x_2).

Since $gf_1(x_1)$ is defined, $f_1(x)$ is defined for all $x \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} x_1$.

Since $f_2 \subseteq f_1$ and since $x_2 \in \mathsf{Dom}(gf_2) \subseteq \mathsf{Dom}(f_2) \subseteq \mathsf{Dom}(f_1)$, we have $f_2(x_2) = f_1(x_2)$. Let $z_2 \in \mathsf{domC}(f_2)$ be such that $x_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} z_2$. Then, $z_2 \leq_{\mathsf{pref}} x_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} x_1$, hence $z_2 \parallel_{\mathsf{pref}} x_1$; so we have two cases: $x_1 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} z_2$, or $x_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} z_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} x_1$.

Case 1: $x_1 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} z_2$ ($\in \mathsf{domC}(f_2)$):

Then $x_1 \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_2)$, thus $f_2(x_1) = f_1(x_1)$ (since $f_2 \subseteq f_1$, and $f_2(x_1)$ is defined). So $gf_2(x_1) = gf_1(x_1)$, and $gf_2(x_1)$ is defined, i.e., $x_1 \in \mathsf{Dom}(gf_2)$. Since $x_2 \in \mathsf{domC}(f_2)$ and $x_2 \parallel_{\mathsf{pref}} x_1$, it follows that $x_1 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} x_2$. So $x_1 = x_2$ (since we also have $x_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} x_1$). So $|x_1|$, $|x_2|$ are $\mathcal{T}$-related.

Case 2: $x_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} z_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} x_1$.

Since $z_2 \in \mathsf{domC}(f_2)$, $f_2(z_2)$ is defined, hence $f_2(z_2) = f_1(z_2)$ (since $f_2 \subseteq f_1$). Hence $gf_2(z_2)$ is defined (since $gf_1(x)$ is defined for all $x \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} x_1$, and $f_2(z_2) = f_1(z_2)$), i.e., $z_2 \in \mathsf{Dom}(gf_2)$. Therefore, $z_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} x_2$, since $z_2 \parallel_{\mathsf{pref}} x_2$ and $x_2 \in \mathsf{domC}(gf_2)$. But since we also have $x_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} z_2$, it follows that $z_2 = x_2$.

Let $z_1 \in \mathsf{domC}(f_1)$ be such that $x_1 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} z_1$. Then we have the $\geq_{\mathsf{pref}}$-chain $x_2 = z_2 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} x_1 \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} z_1$. Since $f_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} f_2$, there exists $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $|z_2| \leq \tau(|z_1|)$, hence since $x_2 = z_2$ and $|z_1| \leq |x_1|$, $|x_2| \leq \tau(|x_1|)$. Also, $|x_1| \leq |x_2|$. So, $|x_1|$ and $|x_2|$ are $\mathcal{T}$-related. $\square$

Notation: Let $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}/\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ denote the set of $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$-congruence classes in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$; we will abbreviate $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}/\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ by $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathcal{T}}$. In particular, we will consider $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$, $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{E3}}$, and $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{lin}}$.

Similarly, $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathbf{NP}}/\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ denotes the set of $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$-congruence classes in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathbf{NP}}$. Here, $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathbf{NP}}$ (also called $\mathcal{RM}^{\Sigma_1}$) is the monoid

$$\mathcal{RM}^{\mathbf{NP}} \ = \ \{f : f \text{ is a polynomially balanced right-ideal morphism } A^* \to A^* \text{ that is computable by a polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine with an oracle in } \mathsf{NP}\}.$$

See [3], section 6, for more details on the similarly defined $\mathsf{fP}^{\mathbf{NP}}$.

By Theorem 4.3 we have:

Corollary 4.4 *For every monoid $\mathcal{M}$ of right-ideal morphisms with polynomial I/O-balance, $\mathcal{M}/\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ is a monoid. In particular, $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathbf{P}}/\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}}$ $(= \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}})$ and $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathbf{NP}}/\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}}$ are monoids, and there is a homomorphic embedding*

$$\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}} \quad \hookrightarrow \quad \mathcal{RM}^{\mathbf{NP}}/\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} .$$

Proof. The first statements follow from the fact that $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ is a congruence.

Every $\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}}$-class of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathbf{NP}}$ contains at most one $\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}}$-class of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, since $\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}}$ is transitive; hence we have the embedding. $\square$

But if $\mathsf{P} \neq \mathsf{NP}$ then a $\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}}$-class of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathbf{NP}}$ that contains elements of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ could also contain functions that are not in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$; i.e., a $\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}}$-class of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ could be a strict subset of the corresponding $\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}}$-class if $\mathsf{P} \neq \mathsf{NP}$. So if $\mathsf{P} \neq \mathsf{NP}$, the embedding above is not an inclusion.

Let $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2$ be families of functions as in Def. 3.1. If $\mathcal{T}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{T}_2$ then $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}_1} \subseteq \equiv_{\mathcal{T}_2}$; hence there exists a surjective monoid morphism $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}/\equiv_{\mathcal{T}_1} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}/\equiv_{\mathcal{T}_2}$. In particular we have surjective monoid morphisms

$$\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{ExpPolyLog}} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{E3}} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{bd}} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}} \twoheadrightarrow \{\mathbf{1}\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{end}}$ is congruence-simple, the right-most arrow (onto the one-element monoid) cannot be factored (except by using automorphisms as factors).

Proposition 4.5 *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be as in Def. 3.1, with the additional condition that every polynomial has an upper-bound in $\mathcal{T}$. Then every $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$-class of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ contains functions whose I/O-balance and time-complexity are linear.*

Proof. For any $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ and any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ consider $F_{f,\tau} \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ defined by

$$\mathsf{domC}(F_{f,\tau}) \;=\; \bigcup_{x \in \mathsf{domC}(f)} x\, \{0,1\}^{\tau(|x|)}, \text{ and}$$
$$F_{f,\tau}(xzw) \;=\; f(x)\, zw,$$

for $x \in \mathsf{domC}(f)$, $|z| = \tau(|x|)$, and $w \in \{0,1\}^*$. Then $f \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} F_{f,\tau}$.

Let $T(.)$ be a polynomial upper bound on the I/O-balance and the time-complexity functions of f. Let us choose $\tau(.)$ larger than $T(.)$, and larger than the time it takes to compute $T(n)$ on input n (when n is written in unary); recall that τ itself is time-constructible, so $\tau(n)$ (in binary representation) can be computed in time $\tau(n)$. Then $F_{f,\tau}$ has linear I/O-balance and time-complexity, by the classical padding argument. □

We saw in [3] that fP and $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ do not contain evaluation maps (contrary to the monoid fR of all partial recursive functions with partial recursive balance function). By definition, a (coded) evaluation map for fR is a partial function $\mathsf{eval} \in \mathsf{fR}$ such that for every $f \in \mathsf{fR}$ there exists $w \in \{0,1\}^*$ (called a program for f) such that for all $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f)$: $\mathsf{eval}(\mathsf{code}(w)\ 11\, x) = f(x)$. We saw that fP and $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ contain partial functions that play the role of evaluation maps in a limited way: For every polynomial q of degree > 1 there exists eval_q that works as an evaluation map for functions whose time-complexity and I/O-balance are less than q; for fP, see section 4 of [3], for $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, see section 2 of [2].

An interesting property of $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ is that it has "evaluation elements" that play the same role as evaluation maps; of course, elements of $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ are not maps but classes of maps. We will also see that $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$, contrary to $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, is finitely generated.

Definition 4.6 *A class $[e_0] \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ is called an* evaluation element *iff there exists $e \in [e_0]$ such that for every $[f_0] \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$, there exists $u \in \{0,1\}^*$ such that $[e(\mathsf{code}(u)\ 11\,(\cdot))] = [f_0(\cdot)]$.*

Here $\mathsf{code}(u)\ 11\,(\cdot)$ denotes the function $x \in \{0,1\}^* \longmapsto \mathsf{code}(u)\ 11\, x$.

Equivalently,

$(\exists e \in [e_0])\ (\forall [f_0] \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}})\ (\exists f \in [f_0])\ (\exists u \in \{0,1\}^*)\ (\forall x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f)) : \quad e(\mathsf{code}(u)\ 11\, x) = f(x).$

Theorem 4.7 *The monoid $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ has evaluation elements and is finitely generated.*

Proof. For any polynomial q of degree > 1 we consider the evaluation function evalR^C_q defined by $\mathsf{evalR}^C_q(\mathsf{code}(u)\ 11\, xz) = \phi_u(x)\ z$, where u is any program with linear time-complexity and I/O-balance, $x \in \mathsf{domC}(\phi_u)$, and $z \in A^*$. By Prop. 4.5, every $\phi_v \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is polynomially end-equivalent to some

$\phi_u \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ such that ϕ_u has linear time-complexity and I/O-balance; thus, $[\mathsf{evalR}_q^C]$ is an evaluation element.

Defining evR_q^C by $\mathsf{evR}_q^C(\mathsf{code}(u)\ 11\, xz) = \mathsf{code}(u)\ 11\ \phi_u(x)\ z$, we also have

$$\phi_u \ = \ \pi'_{|\mathsf{code}(u)\,11|} \circ \mathsf{evR}_q^C \circ \pi_{\mathsf{code}(u)\,11}.$$

So, $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ is generated by $\{[\pi_0], [\pi_1], [\pi'_1\ [\mathsf{evR}_q^C]\}$. $\square$

We saw that when $\mathsf{poly} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ then $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathcal{T}}$ is a homomorphic image of $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$. Hence we have:

Corollary 4.8 *If* $\mathsf{poly} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ *then* $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathcal{T}}$ *is finitely generated.* $\square$

Proposition 4.9 *The monoid* $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{E3}}$ *is regular.*

Proof. Consider $[f] \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{E3}}$, i.e., an $\equiv_{E3}$-class for some $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. Suppose f has I/O balance and time-complexity $\leq T$ for some polynomial T. To show that f has an inverse with elementary recursive I/O balance and time-complexity, let $y \in \mathsf{Im}(f)$ and consider all words x of length $|x| \leq T(|y|)$; for each such x we test whether $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f)$, and (if so) we compute $f(x)$, in time $\leq T(|x|)$. On input y we output the first x in length-lexicographic order such that $f(x) = y$. All this takes time $\leq |A|^{\ell} \cdot T(\ell)$, where ℓ is the minimum length of $x \in f^{-1}(y)$; so $\ell \leq T(|y|)$ (by I/O-balance). The bound $|A|^{T(|y|)} \cdot T(T(|y|))$ is elementary recursive, and testing whether $y \in \mathsf{Im}(f)$ is also elementary recursive, since $\mathsf{Im}(f) \in \mathsf{NP} \subset \mathsf{E}_3$. So f has an inverse with elementary recursive I/O balance and time-complexity. $\square$

5 Inverses in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$

In this section we study the regular elements of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ and of $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$, and we eventually show that $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is regular iff $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ is regular.

5.1 Properties of inverses in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$

Here are a few useful facts about inverses that were not proved in [3], [2].

Lemma 5.1 *For every right-ideal morphism* g *we have:*
(1) $\mathsf{imC}(g) \subseteq g(\mathsf{domC}(g))$.
(2) If g *is injective then* $\mathsf{imC}(g) = g(\mathsf{domC}(g))$.
(3) If g' *is an inverse of* g *and if* $\mathsf{Dom}(g') = \mathsf{Im}(g)$, *then the inverse* g' *is injective.*

Proof. (1) Let $y \in \mathsf{imC}(g) \subseteq g(\mathsf{Dom}(g))$; so $y = g(uv)$ for some $u \in \mathsf{domC}(g)$, $v \in A^*$. Since g is a right-ideal morphism, $y = g(u)\ v$. Moreover, $g(u) = st$ for some $s \in \mathsf{imC}(g)$, $t \in A^*$, since $\mathsf{imC}(g)$ is the prefix code for the right ideal $\mathsf{Im}(g)$. So, $y = stv$, hence $y = s$ and $t = v = \varepsilon$ (since y and s are prefix-comparable elements of the prefix-code $\mathsf{imC}(g)$). Hence, $y = g(u)\, v = g(u) \in g(\mathsf{domC}(g))$.
(2) When g is injective, let $g(x) \in g(\mathsf{domC}(g))$ with $x \in \mathsf{domC}(g)$. Then $g(x) \in \mathsf{Im}(g) = \mathsf{imC}(g)\, A^*$; so $g(x) = uv$ for some $u \in \mathsf{imC}(g)$, $v \in A^*$. Let $z \in \mathsf{Dom}(g)$ be such that $g(z) = u$; then $z = st$ for some $s \in \mathsf{domC}(g)$, $t \in A^*$. Hence, $g(x) = uv = g(z)\ v = g(zv) = g(stv)$. Since g is injective, this implies that $x = stv$, so s and x are prefix-comparable. But then $s = x$, since x and s belong to the prefix code $\mathsf{domC}(g)$. Therefore $t = v = \varepsilon$. It follows that $g(x) = uv = u \in \mathsf{imC}(g)$, so $g(x) \in \mathsf{imC}(g)$. Thus, $g(\mathsf{domC}(g)) \subseteq \mathsf{imC}(g)$ when g is injective.
(3) For all $y_1, y_2 \in \mathsf{Dom}(g') = \mathsf{Im}(g)$, $g'(y_i) \in g^{-1}(y_i)$ $(i = 1, 2)$. If $y_1 \neq y_2$ then $g^{-1}(y_1)$ is disjoint from $g^{-1}(y_2)$, so $g'(y_1) \neq g'(y_2)$. $\square$

Proposition 5.2 *If* $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ *(or* $\in \mathsf{fP}$*) is regular then* f *has an* injective *inverse* $f' \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ *(respectively* $\in \mathsf{fP}$*) with the additional property that* $\mathsf{Dom}(f') = \mathsf{Im}(f)$.

Proof. Let $F' \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ (or $\in \mathsf{fP}$) be an inverse of f, so $\mathsf{Im}(f) \subseteq \mathsf{Dom}(F')$. Since f is regular we know (by Prop. 1.9 in [3]) that $\mathsf{Im}(f)$ is in P. Hence the restriction $f' = F'|_{\mathsf{Im}(f)}$ belongs to $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ (respectively to fP). Moreover, the restriction of an inverse of f to $\mathsf{Im}(f)$ is always an injective inverse of f (by Lemma 5.1(3)). □

As a consequence of Prop. 5.2 we have:

Corollary 5.3 *Every regular $\mathcal{D}$-class of fP and of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ contains injective partial functions.* □

Question: Do non-regular $\mathcal{D}$-classes also contain injective partial functions (that are thus not regular)? This is equivalent to the existence of injective one-way functions.

Lemma 5.4.
(1) For every right-ideal morphism $f : A^* \to A^*$ and every prefix code $P \subset A^*$ we have: $f^{-1}(P)$ is a prefix code, and $f^{-1}(P)\,A^* \subseteq f^{-1}(PA^*)$.
(2) There exists $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ and a prefix code P such that $f^{-1}(P)\,A^* \neq f^{-1}(P\,A^*)$.
(3) There exists $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ and a prefix code P such that $f(P)$ is not a prefix code.

Proof. (1) If x_1 is a prefix of $x_2 = x_1u$, with $x_1, x_2 \in f^{-1}(P)$, then $f(x_1)$ and $f(x_2) = f(x_1)\,u$ both belong to the prefix code P, hence $f(x_1) = f(x_1)\,u$, hence $u = \varepsilon$. Now $x_2 = x_1u$ implies $x_2 = x_1$. So, in $f^{-1}(P)$, prefix-related words are equal, hence $f^{-1}(P)$ is a prefix code.

Obviously, $f^{-1}(P) \subseteq f^{-1}(PA^*)$. Moreover, PA^* is a right ideal, hence $f^{-1}(PA^*)$ is a right ideal. Therefore, $f^{-1}(P)\,A^* \subseteq f^{-1}(PA^*)\;A^* = f^{-1}(PA^*)$.
(2) Example: Let $f(0^n1) = 0^n$ for all $n \geq 0$, with $\mathsf{domC}(f) = 0^*1$, and $\mathsf{imC}(f) = \{\varepsilon\}$. Let $P = \{\varepsilon\}$. Then $f^{-1}(P)\;A^* = f^{-1}(\{\varepsilon\})\;\{0,1\}^* = 1\,\{0,1\}^*$, and $f^{-1}(P\,A^*) = f^{-1}(\{0,1\}^*) = 0^*1\,\{0,1\}^*$.
(3) Example: For f as in (2), let $P = 0^*1$. We obtain $f(P) = 0^*$, which is not a prefix code. □

Lemma 5.5 *For any right-ideal morphism f: $f^{-1}(\mathsf{imC}(f)) \subseteq \mathsf{domC}(f)$.*

Proof. If $x \in f^{-1}(\mathsf{imC}(f))$ $(\subseteq \mathsf{Dom}(f))$, then $x = pw$ for some $p \in \mathsf{domC}(f)$ and $w \in A^*$; hence, $f(x) = f(p)\;w$, and $f(x) \in \mathsf{imC}(f)$. Since $f(p)\;w \in \mathsf{imC}(f)$ and $f(p) \in \mathsf{Im}(f)$, we have $f(p)\;w = f(p)$ (since $\mathsf{imC}(f)$ is a prefix code, and $f(p)\,w \in \mathsf{imC}(f)$ cannot have a strict prefix in the right ideal generated by $\mathsf{imC}(f)$). So, $w = \varepsilon$, hence $x = pw = p \in \mathsf{domC}(f)$. □

Definition 5.6 *A right-ideal morphism f is called* normal *iff* $f(\mathsf{domC}(f)) = \mathsf{imC}(f)$.

In other words, f is normal iff its restriction to $\mathsf{domC}(f)$ maps into (hence onto) $\mathsf{imC}(f)$; in other words, f is entirely defined by the way it relates $\mathsf{domC}(f)$ to $\mathsf{imC}(f)$. On the other hand, a non-normal right-ideal morphism g will map $\mathsf{domC}(g)$ to a larger set than $\mathsf{imC}(g)$, i.e., $\mathsf{imC}(g) \subsetneqq g(\mathsf{domC}(g))$.

Examples of normal and non-normal right-ideal morphisms:

Every injective right-ideal morphism is normal (by Lemma 5.1).

The encodings of the elements of fP are normal; we saw near the beginning of the Introduction that for all $f \in \mathsf{fP}$, f^C is normal.

The following is a non-normal regular element of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$: Let $\mathsf{domC}(g) = 0\,1^*$; and let $g(0^n1\,w) = 0^n\,w$ for all $n \geq 0$ and all $w \in \{0,1\}^*$. Then $\mathsf{imC}(g) = \{\varepsilon\} \neq 0^* = g(\mathsf{domC}(g)$. So in this example, $\mathsf{imC}(g)$ and $g(\mathsf{domC}(g)$ are extremely different.

Lemma 5.7 *A right-ideal morphism f is normal iff $\mathsf{domC}(f) = f^{-1}(\mathsf{imC}(f))$.*

Proof. The right-to-left implication is trivial since $ff^{-1} = \mathsf{id}|_{\mathsf{Im}(f)}$.

Conversely, let us assume normality, i.e., $f(\mathsf{domC}(f)) = \mathsf{imC}(f)$. Then $f^{-1}(\mathsf{imC}(f)) \subseteq \mathsf{domC}(f)$ by Lemma 5.5. To prove that $\mathsf{domC}(f) \subseteq f^{-1}(\mathsf{imC}(f))$, let $x \in \mathsf{domC}(f)$. Then $f(x) \in f(\mathsf{domC}(f)) = \mathsf{imC}(f)$; the latter equality holds by the assumption of normality. So, $f(x) \in \mathsf{imC}(f)$, hence $x \in f^{-1}(\mathsf{imC}(f))$. Thus, $\mathsf{domC}(f) \subseteq f^{-1}(\mathsf{imC}(f))$. □

Proposition 5.8 *(1) The set* $\{f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}} : f \text{ is normal}\}$ *is* not *closed under composition, i.e., it is not a submonoid. In fact, there exist regular normal elements of* $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ *whose composite is regular but not normal.*
(2) There exist a regular normal $g \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ *and a prefix code* $P \subset \mathsf{Dom}(g)$ *with* $P \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} \mathsf{domC}(g)$*, such that* $g(P)$ *is not a prefix code.*

Proof. (1) This is shown by the following example. Let $f, g \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ be defined by $\mathsf{domC}(f) = \{0,1\}$ and $f(0) = 0$, $f(1) = 10$; $\mathsf{domC}(g) = \{0,1\}$ and $g(0) = g(1) = 0$. Then $f(\mathsf{domC}(f)) = \mathsf{imC}(f) = \{0, 10\}$, and $g(\mathsf{domC}(g)) = \mathsf{imC}(g) = \{0\}$; so, f and g are normal. Now, $\mathsf{domC}(gf) = \{0,1\}$ and $gf(0) = 0$, $gf(1) = 00$. So, $gf(\mathsf{domC}(gf)) = \{0, 00\}$, which is not a prefix code; and $\mathsf{imC}(gf) = \{0\}$. Thus, gf is not normal.
(2) Take g as above, and $P = \{0, 10, 11\}$. Then $g(P) = \{0, 00, 01\}$, which is not a prefix code. □.

We know (Prop. 6.1 in [3]) that every element of fP, and in particular, every element of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, has an inverse in $\mathsf{fP}^{\mathsf{NP}}$. We show next that every element of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ has an inverse in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathbf{NP}}$. We first extend Prop. 2.6 of [3] to $\mathsf{fP}^{\mathsf{NP}}$ and to $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathbf{NP}}$.

Miscellaneous

The remaining Definition and Facts of this subsection will not be used in the rest of the paper.

Definition 5.M1 *For any right-ideal morphism* $f : A^* \to A^*$*, the* normalization f_N *of* f *is the restriction of* f *to* $f^{-1}(\mathsf{imC}(f))\ A^*$*. So,* $\mathsf{domC}(f_N) = f^{-1}(\mathsf{imC}(f))$ *(*$\subseteq \mathsf{domC}(f)$*).*

Then f_N is normal: $f_N(\mathsf{domC}(f_N) = f(\mathsf{domC}(f_N)) = f(f^{-1}(\mathsf{imC}(f)) = \mathsf{imC}(f)$, and this is equal to $\mathsf{imC}(f_N)$, by Prop. 5.M2 (next). Moreover, $f^{-1}(\mathsf{imC}(f))$ is a prefix code (by Lemma 5.4(1)).

Note that $f_N \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ iff $f^{-1}(\mathsf{imC}(f)) \in \mathsf{P}$. Indeed, if $f_N \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ then $\mathsf{domC}(f_N) \in \mathsf{P}$; and if $\mathsf{domC}(f_N) \in \mathsf{P}$ then the restriction of f $(\in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}})$ is in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$.

We conjecture that f_N is not always in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ when $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$; this conjecture is motivated by Prop. 5.M3 below.

Proposition 5.M2 *For any right-ideal morphism* f *and its normalization* f_N*, we have:* $\mathsf{Im}(f_N) = \mathsf{Im}(f)$*, and* $\mathsf{imC}(f_N) = \mathsf{imC}(f)$*.*

Proof. Obviously, $\mathsf{Im}(f_N) \subseteq \mathsf{Im}(f)$. Conversely, let $y \in \mathsf{Im}(f)$, so $y = qw$ for some $q \in \mathsf{imC}(f)$ and $w \in A^*$. Then $q = f(p)$ for some $p \in \mathsf{domC}(f) \cap f^{-1}(\mathsf{imC}(f)) = \mathsf{domC}(f_N)$, hence $y = f(p)\,w = f(pw) \in \mathsf{Im}(f_N)$. □

We know that for all $f \in \mathsf{fP}$, $\mathsf{Dom}(f)$ is in P and $\mathsf{Im}(f)$ is in NP (Prop. 1.9 in [3]). What can be said about the complexity of $\mathsf{imC}(f)$? The complexity class DP $(\subseteq \Delta_2^{\mathsf{P}} = \mathsf{P}^{\mathsf{NP}})$ is defined by

$$\mathsf{DP} \;=\; \{L_1 - L_0 \;:\; L_1, L_0 \in \mathsf{NP}\}.$$

Obviously, $\mathsf{NP} \cup \mathsf{coNP} \subseteq \mathsf{DP}$. There exist DP-complete problems, e.g., the following: $\mathsf{critical3SAT} = \{\beta : \beta$ is a boolean formula in $\mathsf{3cnf}$ that is not satisfiable, but for every clause c in β, the removal of c results in a boolean formula $\beta - \{c\}$ that is satisfiable$\}$. See e.g. [11].

Proposition 5.M3 *For all* $f \in \mathsf{fP}$, $\mathsf{imC}(f)$ *is in* DP*, and when* f *is normal then* $\mathsf{imC}(f)$ *is in* NP*.*

Proof. We have $x \in \mathsf{imC}(f)$ iff the following hold: (1) $x \in \mathsf{Im}(f)$, and (2) for every strict prefix p of x: $p \notin \mathsf{Im}(f)$. The second condition is equivalent to $\mathsf{not}(\exists p)[\,p <_{\mathsf{pref}} x \;\text{ and }\; p \in \mathsf{Im}(f)\,]$. Hence, $\mathsf{imC}(f) \in \mathsf{DP}$.

However since $\mathsf{domC}(f)$ is in P, $f(\mathsf{domC}(f))$ is in NP; so when f is normal then $\mathsf{imC}(f)$ $(= f(\mathsf{domC}(f)))$ is in NP. □

Normalization works well with inverses:

Proposition 5.M4 *For any right-ideal morphism* f *and its normalization* f_N *we have:*

(1) If f_1' is an inverse of f_N then f_1' is also an inverse of f.
(2) If f' is any inverse of f then the restriction F' of f' to $\mathsf{Im}(f)$ is an injective (hence normal) inverse of f. Moreover, if $f, f' \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ then $F' \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$.

Proof. (1) Let us show that f_1' is an inverse of f. Since $\mathsf{Im}(f) = \mathsf{Im}(f_N)$, for all $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f)$ there exists $x_1 \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_N)$ such that $f(x) = f_N(x_1)$. Now, $f(x) = f_N(x_1) = f_N f_1' f_N(x_1) = f_N f_1' f(x) \subseteq f f_1' f(x)$; the latter holds since f_N is a restriction of f. But since $f f_1' f$ is a function, and $f_N f_1' f(x)$ is defined, we have $f_N f_1' f(x) = f f_1' f(x)$. Thus, $f(x) = f f_1' f(x)$.
(2) The only part of the domain of an inverse of f that matters (in the relation $f f' f = f$) is $\mathsf{Im}(f)$ (which is always a subset of $\mathsf{Dom}(f')$). So the restriction F' of f' to $\mathsf{Im}(f)$ is an inverse of f. For any inverse f' of f we have: $f'(\mathsf{imC}(f)) \subseteq f^{-1}(\mathsf{imC}(f))$, which is a prefix code by Lemma 5.4(1); so, F' is normal. For any inverse, the restriction to $\mathsf{Im}(f)$ is injective, since for all $y_1 \neq y_2$ in $\mathsf{Im}(f)$, $f^{-1}(y_1)$ and $f^{-1}(y_2)$ are disjoint.

If $f, f' \in \mathcal{RM}_2^{\mathsf{P}}$ then f is regular, so by Prop. 1.9 in [3], $\mathsf{Im}(f)$ is in P. Hence the restriction of f' to $\mathsf{Im}(f)$ is in $\mathcal{RM}_2^{\mathsf{P}}$. □.

We know (Prop. 6.1 in [3]) that every element of fP, and in particular, every element of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, has an inverse in $\mathsf{fP}^{\mathsf{NP}}$. We show next that every element of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ has an inverse in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathbf{NP}}$. We first extend Prop. 2.6 of [3] to $\mathsf{fP}^{\mathsf{NP}}$ and to $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathbf{NP}}$.

Lemma 5.M5 *If an element $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ has an inverse in fP (or in $\mathsf{fP}^{\mathsf{NP}}$), then f also has an inverse in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ (respectively in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathbf{NP}}$).*

Moreover, this inverse in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ (resp. $\mathsf{fP}^{\mathsf{NP}}$) can be chosen to be injective (and hence normal).

Proof. If f has an inverse in fP then the result was proved in Prop. 2.6 of [3].

Let $f_0' \in \mathsf{fP}^{\mathsf{NP}}$ be an inverse of f; we want to construct an inverse f' of f that belongs to $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathbf{NP}}$. We know (Prop. 1.9 of [3]) that $\mathsf{Im}(f)$ is in NP. Hence we can restrict f_0' to $\mathsf{Im}(f)$, i.e., $\mathsf{Dom}(f_0') = \mathsf{Im}(f)$. We proceed to define $f'(y)$ for $y \in \mathsf{Im}(f)$.

First, we compute the shortest prefix p of y that satisfies $p \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_0') = \mathsf{Im}(f)$. Since $\mathsf{Im}(f) \in \mathsf{NP}$, this can be done in polynomial time with calls to an NP oracle. Now, $y = p\,z$ for some string z.

Second, we define $f'(y) = f_0'(p)\,z$, where p and z are as above. Thus, f' is a right-ideal morphism.

Let us verify that f' has the claimed properties. Clearly, f' is computable in polynomial time with calls to an NP oracle, and is polynomially balanced (the latter following from the fact that f' is an inverse of f, which we prove next); thus, f' is a right-ideal morphism in $\mathsf{fP}^{\mathsf{NP}}$, so $f' \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathbf{NP}}$. To prove that f' is an inverse of f, let $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f)$. Then $f(f'(f(x))) = f(f'(p\,z))$, where $y = f(x) = p\,z$, and p is the shortest prefix of y such that $p \in \mathsf{Im}(f)$. Then, $f'(p\,z) = f_0'(p)\,z$, by the definition of f'. Then, since f is a right-ideal morphism, $f(f_0'(p)\,z) = f(f_0'(p))\,z = p\,z$ (the latter since f_0' is an inverse of f, and since $p \in \mathsf{Im}(f)$). Hence, $f f'|_{\mathsf{Im}(f)} = \mathsf{id}_{\mathsf{Im}(f)}$. Thus, f' is an inverse of f.

Note that since $\mathsf{Dom}(f') = \mathsf{Im}(f)$, the inverse f' described above is injective. Indeed, if $\mathsf{Dom}(f') = \mathsf{Im}(f)$ then $f' = f'|_{\mathsf{Im}(f)}$, so $f f' = \mathsf{id}_{\mathsf{Dom}(f')}$, which implies that f' is injective (hence normal by Lemma 5.1). □

Proposition 5.M6 *Every element of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ has an inverse in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathbf{NP}}$, and this inverse can be chosen to be injective (and hence normal).*

Proof. By Prop. 6.1 in [3], every element of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ has an inverse in $\mathsf{fP}^{\mathsf{NP}}$. The result then follows from Lemma 5.M5. □

Proposition 5.M7 *Let $f_0 \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, and let f be any right-ideal morphism such that $f \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} f_0$. Then $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ iff $\mathsf{Dom}(f) \in \mathsf{P}$.*

Hence, if $f_0 \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, and $\mathsf{Dom}(f) \in \mathsf{P}$, and $f \notin \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, then $f \not\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} f_0$.

Proof. We know that for all $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, $\mathsf{Dom}(f) \in \mathsf{P}$. For the converse, if $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f)$ (which can be checked in polynomial time), then either $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_0)$ or x is a prefix of a word $xu \in \mathsf{domC}(f_0)$. If $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_0)$ we can immediately compute $f_0(x)$ $(= f(x))$, using the polynomial-time algorithm of f_0.

If $xu \in \mathsf{domC}(f_0)$ for some $u \in A^*$, we can compute $f_0(xu)$ in polynomial time (as a function of $|xu|$). Here, u is the shortest word such that $xu \in \mathsf{domC}(f_0)$. So, $|u|$ is polynomially bounded in terms of $|x|$ (because $\mathsf{domC}(f) \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} \mathsf{domC}(f_0)$). Therefore, the computation of $f_0(xu)$ takes polynomial time as a function of $|x|$.

Also, $f_0(xu) = f(xu) = f(x)\ u$; so we obtain $f(x)$ by removing the suffix u from $f_0(xu)$; we know u, since it is the shortest word such that $xu \in \mathsf{domC}(f_0)$ (and $\mathsf{domC}(f_0) \in \mathsf{P}$ when $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$). □

Proposition 5.M8
(1) There exist prefix codes $P_1, P_0 \subset A^*$ such that $P_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} P_0$, and $P_0 \in \mathsf{P}$, but $P_1 \notin \mathsf{P}$. The prefix code P_1 can be chosen to have any complexity above polynomial, or to be undecidable; if $\mathsf{P} \neq \mathsf{NP}$ then P_1 can be chosen in DP.

(2) There exist right ideal morphisms f_1, f_0 such that $f_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} f_0$, and $f_0 \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, but $f_1 \notin \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. If $\mathsf{P} \neq \mathsf{NP}$ then f_1 can be chosen in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathbf{NP}}$.

Proof. (1) We construct a family of examples. Let $L \subset A^*$ be any set that is not in P. Let

$$P_0 \ = \ \{00, 01\}^*\, 11, \quad \text{and}$$
$$P_1 \ = \{\mathsf{code}(x)\ 11 \ : \ x \in L\} \cup \{\mathsf{code}(x)\ 110 \ : \ x \notin L\} \cup \{\mathsf{code}(x)\ 111 \ : \ x \notin L\}.$$

Then P_1, P_0 are prefix codes, $P_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} P_0$, and $P_0 \in \mathsf{P}$. But $P_1 \notin \mathsf{P}$ since L is polynomial-time reducible to P_1.

(2) Let f_0, f_1 be the identity map restricted to P_0A^*, respectively P_1A^* (with P_0, P_1 as above). Then $f_1 \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} f_0$, and $f_0 \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$; but $f_1 \notin \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ since $\mathsf{domC}(f_1) = P_1 \notin \mathsf{P}$. If $\mathsf{P} \neq \mathsf{NP}$ then L can be chosen in $\mathsf{NP} - \mathsf{P}$, and then $f_1 \notin \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. □

Question: Assuming $\mathsf{P} \neq \mathsf{NP}$, is there $F \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ such that for all $f \in F$: $\mathsf{Dom}(f) \notin \mathsf{P}$?

5.2 $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ vs. $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, regarding regularity

It is obvious that if $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is regular then $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ $(= \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}/\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}})$ is regular, being a homomorphic image of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. The converse is also true, but the proof is not obvious, mainly because of the existence on non-normal functions in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. Many of the results of this sub-section hold for $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathcal{T}}$ (where $\mathcal{T}$ is any family of functions as in Def. 3.1).

Lemma 5.9 *If f_0, f are right-ideal morphisms with $f_0 \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} f$ and $f_0 \subseteq f$, then $\mathsf{imC}(f_0) \equiv_{\mathsf{end}} \mathsf{imC}(f)$.*
If $\mathsf{poly} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ and $f_0, f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ satisfy $f_0 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} f$ and $f_0 \subseteq f$, then $\mathsf{imC}(f_0) \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} \mathsf{imC}(f)$.

Compare with Lemma 3.19.

Proof. Since $f_0 \subseteq f$ we also have $\mathsf{Im}(f_0) \subseteq \mathsf{Im}(f)$. Suppose a right ideal R intersects $\mathsf{Im}(f)$; so there exists $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f)$ such that $f(x) \in R \cap \mathsf{Im}(f)$. Hence, $x \in f^{-1}(R \cap \mathsf{Im}(f)) = f^{-1}(R) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(f)$; so the right ideal $f^{-1}(R)$ intersects $\mathsf{Dom}(f)$, hence by end-equivalence, $f^{-1}(R)$ also intersects $\mathsf{Dom}(f_0)$. So there exists $x_0 \in f^{-1}(R) \cap \mathsf{Dom}(f_0)$, and this implies that $f(x_0) \in ff^{-1}(R) \cap f(\mathsf{Dom}(f_0)) = R \cap \mathsf{Im}(f_0)$. So, R intersects $\mathsf{Im}(f_0)$.

For the second statement, let $y_0 \in \mathsf{imC}(f_0)$ and $y \in \mathsf{imC}(f)$ be such that $y \leq_{\mathsf{pref}} y_0 = yw$ (for some $w \in A^*$). We want to show that $|y_0|$ and $|y|$ are related by some function in $\mathcal{T}$. Since $f_0^{-1}(\mathsf{imC}(f_0)) \subseteq \mathsf{domC}(f_0)$ and $f^{-1}(\mathsf{imC}(f)) \subseteq \mathsf{domC}(f)$ (by Lemma 5.5), there exists $x \in \mathsf{domC}(f)$ such that $y = f(x)$, and hence $y_0 = f(x)\, w = f(xw)$; and $xw \in f_0^{-1}(\mathsf{imC}(f_0)) \subseteq \mathsf{domC}(f_0)$. So, $x \in \mathsf{domC}(f)$ and $xw \in \mathsf{domC}(f_0)$, and $xw \geq_{\mathsf{pref}} x$, hence $|x|$ and $|xw|$ are length-related by a function in $\mathcal{T}$ (because $f_0 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} f$). Moreover, $|f(x)|$ and $|x|$ are polynomially related (because of the I/O-balance of f), and $|f_0(xw)|$ and $|xw|$ are polynomially related (because of the I/O-balance of f_0). Thus, $|y|$ and $|y_0|$ are length-related by a function in $\mathcal{T}$. □

Lemma 5.10 *Let h, g be any right-ideal morphisms such that $hgh \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} h$. Then $hgh \subseteq h$, and $hgh\ g\ hgh = hgh$.*

Proof. For all functions we have $\mathsf{Dom}(hgh) \subseteq \mathsf{Dom}(h)$, so since $hgh \equiv_{\mathsf{bd}} h$, we have $hgh \subseteq h$. Hence, for all $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(hgh)$ we have $hgh(x) = h(x)$, and hg is defined on $h(x)$. Since $hgh(x) = h(x)$ and hg is defined on $h(x)$, hg is defined on $hgh(x)$, and we have $hghgh(x) = hgh(x) = h(x)$ for all $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(hgh)$. By the same argument, hg is defined on $hghgh(x)$, on $hgh(x)$, and on $h(x)$, and we have: $hghghgh(x) = hghgh(x) = hgh(x) = h(x)$. In particular: $hgh\, g\, hgh(x) = hgh(x)$ for all $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(hgh)$. $\square$

Proposition 5.11 *Let F, G be any $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$-equivalence classes in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. Then we have:*

(Inverses) *$FGF = F$ iff there exist $f \in F$ and $g \in G$ such that $fgf = f$.*

(Mutual inverses) *$FGF = F$ and $GFG = G$ iff there exist $f \in F$ and $g \in G$ such that $fgf = f$ and $gfg = g$.*

Proof. For the first statement: If $f \in F$ and $g \in G$ satisfy $fgf = f$ then $FGF = F$ since $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ is a congruence, and $F = [f]$, $G = [g]$. Conversely, if $FGF = F$ then for any $h \in F$, $g \in G$, we have $hgh \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} h$. Hence, for any $g \in G$, letting $f = hgh \in FGF = F$ we have $fgf = f$ (by Lemma 5.10).

For the second statement: The right-to-left implication is obvious since $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ is a congruence. Conversely, $FGF = F$ implies $fg_1f = f$ for some $f \in F$ and $g_1 \in G$ (by the "Inverses" statement of the Proposition, that we just proved). Let $g = g_1fg_1 \in GFG = G$. Then $fgf = fg_1fg_1f = fg_1f = f$, and $gfg = g_1fg_1fg_1fg_1 = g_1fg_1fg_1 = g_1fg_1 = g$. $\square$

Lemma 5.12 *Let $P_0, P_1 \subset A^*$ be prefix codes with $P_0A^* \subseteq P_1A^*$ and $P_0 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} P_1$; let $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ be the function used for $P_0 \equiv_{\mathcal{T}} P_1$. Then for every $y_1 \in P_1$ and every $t \in A^*$ with $|t| \geq \tau(|y_1|)$: $y_1t \in P_0A^*$.*

Proof. By definition, $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ implies $\equiv_{\mathsf{bd}}$, so $P_0A^\omega = P_1A^\omega$ (by Prop. 3.2). Hence for all $y_1 \in P_1$, $t \in A^*$, and $w \in A^\omega$: the end y_1tw intersects P_0, i.e., some prefix of y_1tw is in P_0. If $|t| \geq \tau(|y_1|)$ then this prefix is a prefix of y_1t (by the definition of $\equiv_{\mathcal{T}}$ and the choice of τ). Hence, $y_1t \in P_0A^*$. $\square$

Terminology: A *normal inverse* of a right-ideal morphism f is any normal right-ideal morphism f' (i.e., $f'(\mathsf{domC}(f')) = \mathsf{imC}(f')$, by Def. 5.6) such that f' is an inverse of f.

Lemma 5.13 *Let g, f be right-ideal morphisms such that $g \subseteq f$. Then every inverse f' of f is also an inverse of g.*

Proof. For $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(g)$ we have $gf'g(x) = ff'f(x) = f(x) = g(x)$, since $g \subseteq f$. $\square$

Lemma 5.14 and Theorem 5.16 below are only proved for $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$; it is not clear for what other $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathcal{T}}$ they hold.

For the next Lemma, recall that if $g \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is regular then g has a normal inverse $g' \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$; in fact, we can choose g' to be injective such that $\mathsf{Dom}(g') = \mathsf{Im}(g)$ (see Prop. 5.2, Lemma 5.1, and Def. 5.6).

Main Lemma 5.14 (inverse of a $\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}}$-equivalent extension). *Suppose $f, f_0 \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ are such that $f_0 \subseteq f$ and $f_0 \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} f$. Suppose also that f is* normal. *Then we have:*

(1) If f_0 is regular then f is regular.

(2) For every injective inverse $f_0' \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ of f_0 such that $\mathsf{Dom}(f_0') = \mathsf{Im}(f_0)$, there exists an injective *inverse $f_1' \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ of f such that $\mathsf{domC}(f_0') \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} \mathsf{domC}(f_1')$.*

(3) Moreover, f_1' is also an inverse of f_0. But f_1' cannot always be chosen to be an extension of the given f_0'.

Proof. (1) follows from (2), since every regular element f of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ has an injective inverse f' satisfying $\mathsf{Dom}(f') = \mathsf{Im}(f)$ (by Prop. 5.2 and Lemma 5.1).

(2) Let f'_0 be an inverse of f_0 as assumed, hence $f'_0(\mathsf{imC}(f_0)) \subseteq f_0^{-1}(\mathsf{imC}(f_0)) \subseteq \mathsf{domC}(f_0)$ (the latter "$\subseteq$" holds by Lemma 5.5).

Claim: For all $y \in \mathsf{imC}(f)$ and all $t \in A^*$: $f^{-1}(yt) = f^{-1}(y)\ t$.

Proof of claim: [$\subseteq$] $x \in f^{-1}(yt)$ iff $f(x) = yt$, and this implies $f(x) = f(p)\,t$ for every $p \in f^{-1}(y)$ $\subseteq f^{-1}(\mathsf{imC}(f)) = \mathsf{domC}(f)$ (the latter equality holds because f is normal, see Lemma 5.7). Also, $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f)$ implies that $x = p'w$ for some $p' \in \mathsf{domC}(f)$, $w \in A^*$; thus, $f(p') \in f(\mathsf{domC}(f)) = \mathsf{imC}(f)$; the latter equality holds since f is normal. So, $f(p') \in \mathsf{imC}(f)$. Now, $f(x) = f(p')\,w = f(p)\,t$, hence $f(p') = f(p)$ $(= y)$, since $\mathsf{imC}(f)$ is a prefix code (and $f(p'), f(p) = y \in \mathsf{imC}(f)$). Hence $w = t$, and $p' \in f^{-1}(f(p')) = f^{-1}(y)$. Thus, $x = p't \in f^{-1}(y)\,t$.
[$\supseteq$] $x \in f^{-1}(y)\ t$ implies $f(x) \in f(f^{-1}(y)\,t)$. Since $f^{-1}(y) \subseteq f^{-1}(\mathsf{imC}(f)) = \mathsf{domC}(f)$ (the latter equality holds since f is normal), we have $f(f^{-1}(y)\,t) = f(f^{-1}(y))\,t = \{yt\}$. Hence, $x \in f^{-1}(yt)$. [End, Proof of Claim]

Now let $y \in \mathsf{imC}(f)$, and let $t \in A^*$ be any string such that $yt \in \mathsf{imC}(f_0)$. Since $f_0 \subseteq f$ and $f_0 \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} f$, we have $\mathsf{imC}(f_0) \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} \mathsf{imC}(f)$ (by Lemma 5.9); hence, $|t| \leq q(|y|)$ for some polynomial q. And by Lemma 5.12 (with $\mathcal{T} = \mathsf{poly}$), we can pick t to be $t = 0^{q(|y|)}$; then t can be computed from y in polynomial time. Since $f'_0(yt) \in f_0^{-1}(yt) \subseteq f^{-1}(yt)$, we have by the Claim: $f'_0(yt) \in f^{-1}(y)\ t$. Since $f'_1(y)$ should belong to $f^{-1}(y)$, we define:

$f'_1(y)$ is is prefix of $f'_0(yt)$ obtained by removing the suffix t.

Then, indeed, $f'_1(y) \in f^{-1}(y)$. In general, for all $y \in \mathsf{imC}(f)$ and all $z \in A^*$, we define $f'_1(yz) = f'_1(y)\ z$. Then $f'_1(yz) \in f^{-1}(yz)$, hence f'_1 is an inverse of f. By construction, $\mathsf{domC}(f'_1) = \mathsf{imC}(f)$, hence f'_1 is injective (by Lemma 5.1(3)). And $f'_1(y)$ is polynomial-time computable, since $t = 0^{q(|y|)}$ and since $f'_0 \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. Finally, f'_1 is polynomially balanced, since f'_0 is polynomially balanced and $|t| \leq q(|y|)$.

By Lemma 5.9, $\mathsf{imC}(f_0) \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} \mathsf{imC}(f)$. Hence, $\mathsf{domC}(f'_0) = \mathsf{imC}(f_0) \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} \mathsf{imC}(f) = \mathsf{domC}(f'_1)$, so $\mathsf{domC}(f'_0) \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} \mathsf{domC}(f'_1)$.

(3) By Lemma 5.13, f'_1 is an inverse of f_0. By Lemma 5.15 below, the inverse f'_0 of f_0 is not necessarily a restriction of an inverse of f; so we cannot always hope for f'_0 to be extendable to an inverse of f. □

Lemma 5.15 *There exist $f, g \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ such that $g \subseteq f$, $g \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} f$, and g is regular, but such that not every inverse $g' \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ (not even every injective inverse) of g is extendable to an inverse of f.*

Proof. This is illustrated by the following example:

$f(0) = f(1) = 1$, with $\mathsf{domC}(f) = \{0, 1\}$, $\mathsf{imC}(f) = \{1\}$; and

$g(00) = g(10) = 10$, $g(01) = g(11) = 11$, with $\mathsf{domC}(g) = \{00, 10, 01, 11\}$, $\mathsf{imC}(g) = \{10, 11\}$.

Then f has two injective inverses, f'_0 and f'_1, given by $f'_0(1) = 0$ and $f'_1(1) = 1$, both with domain code $\{1\}$.

And g has four injective inverses. Two of them, namely g'_0 and g'_0, are restrictions of f'_0, respectively f'_1, defined by $g'_0(10) = 00$, $g'_0(11) = 01$, and $g'_1(10) = 10$, $g'_1(11) = 11$. But the two other injective inverses of g, namely g'_2 and g'_3, are not restrictions of inverses of f; they are defined by $g'_2(10) = 00$, $g'_2(11) = 10$, and $g'_3(10) = 10$, $g'_3(11) = 01$. □

Theorem 5.16 *The monoid $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ is regular iff $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is regular.*

Proof. Obviously, if $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is regular then its homomorphic image $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ is regular, since $\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}}$ is a congruence.

For the converse we will show that if $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ is regular then fP is regular; the latter implies that $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is regular (by Prop. 2.6 of [3]). For any $f \in \mathsf{fP}$, let $f^C \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ be the encoding of f, as defined

near the beginning of the Introduction. Then f^C is normal (see the Examples after Def. 5.6). Let $F = [f^C] \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ be the $\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}}$-class of f^C, and let $F' \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ be an inverse of F. A consequence of $FF'F = F$ in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ is that for all $h \in F$ and all $g \in F'$: $hgh \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} h$. Then by Lemma 5.10, $hgh \in F$ and hgh is regular with inverse $g \in F'$. Also, $hgh \subseteq h$. Let $h = f^C$, which is normal. Then the Lemma 5.14(1) applies since $hgh \subseteq h$, $hgh \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} h$ (with $h = f^C$), h is normal, and hgh is regular. Hence Lemma 5.14(1) implies that $h = f^C$ is regular in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$. Hence by Prop. 3.4(2) in [3], f is regular in fP. $\square$

Comments: The proof of Theorem 5.16 also shows the following fact: *If all normal elements of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ are regular then $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ is regular.* Thus the set of all normal elements of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ plays a crucial role. It remains an open question whether we have the following element-wise properties: Let $F \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ (hence $F \subset \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$); if F is regular in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$, does that imply that every $f \in F$ is regular in $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$? Equivalently, let $f_0, f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ be such that $f_0 \subseteq f$, $f_0 \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} f$, and f_0 is regular; does that imply that f is regular? Lemma 5.14(1) yields this statement when f is normal.

6 A non-regular monoid that maps onto $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$

We show that there is a non-regular submonoid of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ that maps homomorphically onto $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$. The fact that some non-regular monoid maps onto $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ is trivial, by itself, because we could use a (finitely generated) free monoid for this. However, there is a non-regular submonoid $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$ of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$ such that the following monoid homomorphisms (where $\nearrow$ is injective) form a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}} \\ & \nearrow & \downarrow\!\!\downarrow \\ \mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)} & \twoheadrightarrow & \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}} \end{array}$$

The construction of $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$ is intuitive, but we need some definitions.

A function $t : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ is said to be *asymptotically* $n + o(n)$ iff there exists a function $\epsilon : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \epsilon(n) = 0$, and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$: $t(n) \leq n + \epsilon(n) \cdot n$. Clearly, the set of functions that are asymptotically $n + o(n)$ is closed under composition.

An $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$-*machine* is a multi-tape Turing machine M with an input-tape that is read-only, and with an output-tape that is write-only, such that the input-tape head and the output-tape head never move left. Let f_M denote the input-output function of M. We assume that for every $x \in \mathsf{Dom}(f_M)$ and every word $z \in A^*$, the computation of M on input xz has the following property: the input-tape head does not start reading z until $f_M(x)$ has been written on the output tape. (To "read" a letter ℓ means to make a transition whose input-tape letter is ℓ.) This is not the complete definition of an $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$-machine, but that is all we need here; the details are given at the beginning of Section 2 in [2]. We define the following submonoid of $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$:

$$\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)} = \{f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}} : f \text{ can be computed by an } \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}\text{-machine whose input-output balance and time-complexity are asymptotically } n + o(n)\}.$$

An $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$-machine whose time and balance are $n+o(n)$ is called an $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$-*machine*. In other words, an $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$-machine can be described as a "real-time" Turing machine whose delay "constant" has been generalized to a small function with a $o(n)$ upper-bound (where n is the input length). The set of real-time right-ideal homomorphisms is a submonoid of $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$.

Lemma 6.1 *$\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$ is a monoid.*

Proof. Let $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$ and let M_1, M_2 be $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$-machines that compute f_1, respectively f_2. Since the set of functions that are asymptotically $n + o(n)$ is closed under composition, the I/O-balance of $f_2 \circ f_1$ is $n + o(n)$.

To compute $f_2 \circ f_1(x)$ in time $n+o(n)$ (where $n = |x|$), we combine M_1 and M_2 into an $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$-machine M, as follows. The output-tape of M_1 and the input-tape of M_2 are combined into one work-tape of M; we call this work-tape the intermediate tape. On input x, the machine M starts simulating M_1 and starts writing $f_1(x)$ on the intermediate tape; as soon as there is something on this intermediate tape, M starts the simulation of M_2 on $f_1(x)$. The writing of $f_1(x)$ by M_1 takes at most $o(n)$ more steps than it takes to read x; the computation of $f_1(x)$, except for this $o(n)$-step delay, is done in parallel (simultaneously) with the reading of x. Similarly, when M_2 reads $f_1(x)$ as an input, it computes $f_2(f_1(x))$ at the same time as it reads $f_1(x)$, except for a $o(|f_1(x)|)$-step delay; but $o(|f_1(x)|) \leq o(n + o(n)) \leq o(n)$. So the total time taken by M (i.e., M_1 and M_2 working together, mostly in parallel) is $n + o(n)$. □

Proposition 6.2 *The monoid $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$ is non-regular. In fact, there exists a real-time function that has no inverse in $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$.*

Proof. We use the encoding function $\mathsf{code} : \{0,1,\#\}^* \longmapsto \{00,01,11\}^*$, replacing 0 by 00, 1 by 01, and # by 11 (as discussed at the beginning of the Introduction). For a string x, x^{rev} denotes the string in reverse (i.e., backwards) order.

Consider the right-ideal morphism defined for all $x, w \in \{0,1\}^*$ by

$$s : \ \mathsf{code}(x)\ 11\ 0^{|x|}\, w \ \longmapsto\ 0^{2\,|x|}\ 11\ x^{\mathsf{rev}}\, w\ ,$$

where $\mathsf{domC}(s) = \bigcup_{k\geq 0} \{00,01\}^k\, 11\, 0^k$. Thus s is injective and length-preserving. Moreover, s belongs to $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$ since an $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$-machine can compute $s\big(\mathsf{code}(x)\ 11\ 0^{|x|}\, w\big)$ in time $\leq n+o(n)$, where $n = 2\,|x| + 2 + |x| + |w|$, as follows: The machine reads $\mathsf{code}(x)$ in time $2\,|x|$, while writing x on a work-tape and while writing $0^{2\,|x|}$ on the output-tape. When 11 is encountered in the input, the head of the work-tape is at the right end of x. The machine copies 11 to the output-tape, then reads $0^{|x|}$ in the input, while copying the work-tape from right to left to the output-tape; thus, x^{rev} is written. When the work-tape head reaches the left end of the work-tape, the input-tape head reaches w on the input-tape; w is then copied to the output-tape. Note that the above machine is a real-time Turing machine, with running time $\leq n + c$ for some constant $c \geq 0$.

We show next that s does not have an inverse in $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$; hence $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$ is not regular. For every inverse s' of s we have $s'(0^{2\,|x|}\ 11\ x^{\mathsf{rev}}) = \mathsf{code}(x)\ 11\ 0^{|x|}$. It is easy to see that although s' can be chosen so as to belong to $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, s' cannot be evaluated in time $\leq n + o(n)$; here, $n = |\mathsf{code}(x)| + 2 + |x| = 2\,|x| + 2 + |x|$. Indeed, an $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$-machine reads the input $0^{2\,|x|}\ 11\ x^{\mathsf{rev}}$ only once, from left to right. While $0^{2\,|x|}$ is being read, x^{rev} has not yet been seen, so no letter of $\mathsf{code}(x)$ can be written on the output-tape; indeed, the machine is deterministic, so anything written on the output-tape up to this moment would be false for some input x. At the moment x^{rev} starts being read, the machine has made $2\,|x| + 2$ steps, and no output has been written yet. To write down the output (which has length n) will take at least n steps from here onward. So the total time will be $\geq n + 2\,|x| + 2 \geq n + n/2$. But $n + n/2$ does not have $n + o(n)$ as an upper-bound. □

For the next Proposition we need more notation and facts:

For a bitstring $u \in \{0,1\}^*$, $N(u) \in \mathbb{N}$ denotes the number represented by u in *unsigned binary* notation. Conversely, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathsf{bin}(n) \in \{0\} \cup 1\,\{0,1\}^*$ denotes the normalized unsigned binary representation of n; "normalized" means that the representation is without leading 0's, except that zero is represented by 0. The length $|\mathsf{bin}(n)|$ is called the *bit-length* of n; it is a well-known fact that $|\mathsf{bin}(n)| = \lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor + 1$ (taking $\lfloor \log_2 0 \rfloor$ to be 0 here). For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we call the string 0^n the *unary representation* of the number n.

We consider a Turing machine M_0 which converts binary representations to unary representations. More precisely, M_0 takes as input any bitstring u, and outputs $0^{N(u)}$. For our purposes (in Prop.

6.4) we assume that $u \in 1\{0,1\}^*$. The output-tape of M_0 is write-only, and the output head never moves left; the input-tape of M_0 does not have any special properties; M_0 has no work-tapes. M_0 keeps subtracting 1 from u in binary, until u is an all-0 string; at each subtraction, an additional 0 is written on the output-tape. The time-complexity of M_0 on input u is at least $N(u)$ (since that is the output-length). Moreover:

Lemma 6.3 *The Turing machine M_0 on input $u \in 1\{0,1\}^*$ takes time $\Theta(N(u))$ to convert from binary (i.e., u) to unary (i.e., $0^{N(u)}$).*

Proof. We obviously have $2^{|u|-1} \leq N(u) \leq 2^{|u|} - 1$; for the first inequality we use the fact that the leading bit of u is 1.

First, the input tape head moves to the right-most bit of u, using $|u|+2$ steps. The least significant bit of u is the only bit that is changed (in a subtraction of 1) when the least significant bit is 1; this happens for all odd numbers, i.e., half the time, so $< 2^{|u|}/2$ times. In general, the ith-least significant bit of u, together with less-significant bits, is changed $< 2^{|u|}/2^i$ times (for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, |u|-1$); this happens when the content of the input-tape has reached the form $\ldots 10^i$ (and subtracting 1 will change it to $\ldots 01^i$). Changing 10^i to 01^i, and moving the head back to the right end, takes time $2\,(i+2)$. Eventually the input-tape will contain $0^{|u|}$; one more subtraction step will be attempted ($0^{|u|}$ will be changed to $1^{|u|}$), but then the left end of the input-tape will be detect where a 0 or 1 is expected, and the computation halts.

Overall the time used by M_0 to count down in binary from u to $0^{|u|}$ is $\leq \sum_{i=0}^{|u|-1} 2\,(i+2)\; 2^{|u|-i} = 8\left(2^{|u|+1} - |u| - 2 - 2^{|u|-1} + (|u|+1)/2\right)$ (using the identity $\sum_{k=1}^{n} k\, 2^{n-k} = 2^{n+1} - n - 2$). The last scan over $0^{|u|}$ (changing it to $1^{|u|}$ and detecting the left-end of the tape) takes another $|u|+2$ steps. □

Proposition 6.4 *The monoid $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}/\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}/\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}}$ ($= \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$).*

Proof. We will show that the embedding $[g]_{\mathsf{poly}} \in \mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}/\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} \;\longmapsto\; [g]_{\mathsf{poly}} \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ is surjective. For every $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\mathsf{P}}$, with time-complexity and balance $\leq p(.)$ (a polynomial), we will construct a function $g \in \mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$ such that $g \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} f$. This will be done by a padding argument: We let g be the restriction of f to

$$\bigcup_{x \in \mathsf{domC}(f)} x\, A^{q(|x|)}\; A^*,$$

where $q(.)$ is a function that satisfies $q(.) > p(.)^2$ and $q(.) = \Theta(p(.)^2)$; hence we have $g \equiv_{\mathsf{poly}} f$. The function $q(.)$ is defined as follows: For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $q(n)$ is the time that the Turing machine M_0 (discussed in Lemma 6.3 above) uses to convert the binary representation $\mathsf{bin}(p(n)^2)$ to unary representation.

We still need to show that $g \in \mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$. We construct a Turing machine M_g that on input xvw works as follows, where $x \in \mathsf{domC}(f)$, $v \in A^{q(|x|)}$, and $w \in A^*$. First M_g copies x, as well as the prefix of v of length $p(|x|) - |x|$, to a work-tape, while checking in time $\leq p(|x|)$ whether $x \in \mathsf{domC}(f)$. During this process, M_g computes and outputs $f(x)$ (if $x \in \mathsf{domC}(f)$). Since $\mathsf{domC}(f)$ is a prefix code, the end of x, and the beginning of v, can be detected. Let v_1 be the prefix of v read so far (so $|v_1| = p(|x|) - |x|$), and let v_2 be such that $v_1 v_2 = v$. At this point, the output-tape contains $f(x)$, a work-tape contains v_1, and the input-head is at the left-most position of $v_2 w$. So far we have used time $o(n)$, where $n = |xvw|$; indeed, computing and outputting $f(x)$ takes time $p(|x|) \leq \sqrt{n}$, since $p(|x|)^2 < q(|x|) \leq |xw| \leq |xvw| = n$; obviously, $\sqrt{n}$ is $o(n)$.

The strings v_1 and $v_2 w$ will now be copied to the output-tape, but at the same time, M_g needs to check that $|vw| \geq q(|x|)$. In order to check this, M_g computes the number $p(|x|)^2$ in binary; this can be done in time $O(q(|x|))$ (see Section 2 in [2], and Section 4 in [3] for details).

Now M_g counts down from $\mathsf{bin}(p(|x|)^2)$ to zero in binary, as described in Lemma 6.3 above, using exactly $q(|x|)$ steps. Simultaneously, v_1 and then $v_2 w$ are copied to the output-tape. If the counter does not reach zero by the time v_1 and $v_2 w$ have been processed, M_g rejects (since in this case,

$|vw| < q(|x|)$). If counter reaches zero before or at the moment the rest of v_2w has been copied to the output, the copying of v_2w will be continued and completed, and then M_g goes to the accept state.

The total time of the computation (if there is an output, i.e., if it is not rejecting) is $O(p(|x|)$ (for computing $f(x)$ and $\mathsf{bin}(p(|x|)^2)$), plus $|v_1| + |v_2w|$ (for printing v_1 and v_2w while counting down from $\mathsf{bin}(p(|x|)^2)$ to 0). We saw that $O(p(|x|)$ is $o(n)$. Thus the total time is $\leq o(n) + n$. $\square$

Final remark. It is not especially surprising that $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$ is non-regular; ultimately, this is due to the limitations of tapes as storage devices. By itself, it is not too surprising either that $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$ is $\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}}$-equivalent to $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$. The $\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}}$-equivalence of $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ is proved by pushing the familiar padding argument a little further. The combination of the two facts is interesting, however, because $\equiv_{\mathsf{poly}}$-equivalence means that $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ are very close to each other; yet, $\mathcal{RM}^{n+o(n)}$ is non-regular, while the non-regularity of $\mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{P}}_{\mathsf{poly}}$ is equivalent to $\mathsf{P} \neq \mathsf{NP}$.

References

[1] J. Berstel, D. Perrin, Ch. Reutenauer, *Codes and Automata*, Cambridge U.P. (2010).

[2] J.C. Birget, "Infinitely generated semigroups and polynomial complexity". Preprint: http://arXiv.org/abs/1503.04610

[3] J.C. Birget, "Semigroups and one-way functions", *International J. of Algebra and Computation* 25.1-2 (2015) 3-36. Preprint: http://arXiv.org/abs/1306.1447

[4] J.C. Birget, "Bernoulli measure on strings, and Thompson-Higman monoids", *Semigroup Forum* 83.1 (Aug. 2011) 1-32.

[5] J.C. Birget, "Monoid generalizations of the Richard Thompson groups", *J. of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 213(2) (2009) 264-278.

[6] J.C. Birget, "The groups of Richard Thompson and complexity", *International J. of Algebra and Computation* 14(5,6) (Dec. 2004) 569-626.

[7] J.W. Cannon, W.J. Floyd, W.R. Parry, "Introductory notes on Richard Thompson's groups", *L'Enseignement Mathématique* 42 (1996) 215-256.

[8] D.Z. Du, K.I. Ko, *Theory of Computational Complexity*, Wiley (2000).

[9] P.A. Grillet, *Semigroups, An Introduction to the Structure Theory*, Marcel Dekker, New York (1995).

[10] L.H. Hemaspaandra, M. Ogihara, *The Complexity Theory Companion*, Springer 2002.

[11] Ch. Papadimitriou, *Computational Complexity*, Addison-Wesley (1994).

[12] D. Perrin, J.E. Pin, *Infinite Words*, Elsevier (2004).